DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 076 089 HE 003 912

TITLE	Draft: Report of the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education.
INSTITUTION	California State Legislature, Sacramento. Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education.
PUB DATE	Feb 73
NOTE	125p.
AVAILABLE FROM	The Joint Committee, Assembly P.O. Box 83, State Capitol, Sacramento, California 95814 (Free)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Objectives; Educational Planning; *Higher Education; *Master Plans; Planning; *Post Secondary Education; *Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS	*California

ABSTRACT

To enable California higher education to realize its major purpose of responding to the learning needs of California citizens and society, the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education finds the following objectives critical for planning in the next decade: (1) academic freedom and responsibility; (2) equal and universal accessibility for persons of both sexes and all races, ancestries, incomes, ages, and geographies; (3) lifelong learning opportunities for persons with capacity and motivation to benefit; (4) diversity of institutions, services and methods; (5) flexibility to adapt to the changing needs of students and society; (6) cooperation between institutions in assessing area educational needs and resources, and meeting those needs; (7) involvement with local communities in providing educational services and utilizing community resources in the educational process; (8) increased understanding of the learning process to be sought and applied throughout higher education; (9) discovery of qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods for learning, research and teaching; and (10) accountability throughout higher education. Thus, this document presents recommendations for the master plan of higher education in California in keeping with these objectives. (HS)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 076089

DRAFT

REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE MASTER PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE

FEBRUARY 1973

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

D R A F T

REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE MASTER PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

California Legislature

Assemblymen	Senators
John Vasconcellos (Chairman)	Howard Way (Vice Chairman)
Willie Brown	Alfred Alquist
Jerry Lewis	Dennis Carpenter
Ken Meade	Mervyn Dymally
John Stull	Albert Rodda

Patrick M. Callan, Consultant
Daniel Friedlander, Assistant Consultant
Sue Powell, Assistant Consultant
Ronna Safonov, Secretary

February 1973

Permission is granted to reproduce this report. Single copies are available upon request. Comments and requests should be addressed to the Joint Committee, Assembly P.O. Box 83, State Capitol, Sacramento, California 95814.

The future of California postsecondary education depends upon the thoughtful involvement and commitment of every Californian. An open dialogue will help the Legislature and postsecondary education fulfill their responsibilities to the people of California.

To foster that dialogue, the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education has chosen to break tradition and present its report first in draft form to the public, for a final round of discussion and critique. This report contains the tentative recommendations of the Joint Committee.

The Joint Committee hopes you will discuss this draft report with your family, friends, neighbors and colleagues - especially with educators and students. We invite you to share your response with us either in writing or through testimony at one of our five public hearings around the state in March (see Appendix A for schedule of dates and places).

In May the Joint Committee will submit its final report and recommendations to the Legislature for action.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	FOREWORD	i
I.	PURPOSES AND OBJECTIVES	1
II.	STRUCTURE	4
III.	GOVERNANCE	13
IV.	COORDINATION AND PLANNING	28
V.	ACCESS AND RETENTION	44
VI.	COOPERATION BETWEEN INSTITUTIONS	65
VII.	NEW DIRECTIONS	71
VIII.	INDEPENDENT HIGHER EDUCATION	86
IX.	FINANCING	93
	AFTERWORD	108

APPENDICES:

A.	Schedule of Forthcoming Public Hearings on the Draft Report of the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education	114
B.	List of Joint Committee Public Hearings, 1971-1973	115
C.	List of Joint Committee Reports and Publications	116
D.	Notes	117

FOREWORD

The Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education was created by concurrent resolution of the Legislature in September, 1970, and activated in March, 1971.

The Joint Committee began by inviting sixteen hundred Californians to advise us about the design of our study. We convened a two-day conference of ninety persons from all walks of California life for the same purpose. Our first public hearing was a symposium on the future of our society.

The Committee adopted a study plan in January, 1972. Since then we have conducted sixteen public hearings (see Appendix B); sponsored a survey of institutional goals involving 24,750 persons and 121 public and private college communities; commissioned a series of papers which explore issues and discuss alternatives (see Appendix C); regularly met with the officials of California's higher education system; consulted with members of the executive and legislative branches of government and with many state and national experts who have researched and written about higher education; developed a mailing list of 4,500 concerned individuals and

organizations; and read much of the higher education literature.

We were particularly fortunate to have had the benefit of the concurrent study by the Select Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education. We operated in mutual respect, cooperated closely and exchanged all information. Their work has facilitated ours.

We have conducted our study within certain parameters. First, we concerned ourselves with the present and future of postsecondary education.* We tried to learn from history without wasting our energies praising or indicting the past. The fact that California probably has the finest system of higher education in the country is no guarantee for the future.

In addition, we invited the participation of men and women of all ages, ethnic backgrounds, incomes, values, and convictions, including those most directly involved in higher education - educators and students.

Finally, we focused on those issues of public policy which are the legitimate concerns of the Legislature.

---

* "Higher education", as generally used in this report encompasses public and private two-year and four-year colleges and universities. "Postsecondary education" includes higher education as well as private profit and non-profit trade and technical schools and some apprenticeship programs.

We have no desire to manage higher education or to intrude in its day-to-day operations; yet we recognize the responsibility the Legislature bears in appropriating hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars annually in support of California higher education.

This report draws together our tentative conclusions. The recommendations are the result of intensive deliberations among the members of the Joint Committee.

We have learned much. We expect to learn more from public discussions of this draft report. In that spirit we offer these proposals.

CHAPTER I

PURPOSES AND OBJECTIVES

Learning is the primary purpose of California public higher education. Educational institutions exist to respond to the learning needs of our citizens and society.

Learning prepares a person for life and work. It is a process involving intellectual and personal growth. Its function is to assist the individual to develop capacities for good judgment, personal responsibility, lifelong educability and career competence. Learning occurs throughout life and society, but is the special (though not exclusive) responsibility of educational institutions.

A closely related but distinct process, the discovery of knowledge, is another function of higher education. A third function is public service. However, the foremost purpose of each and every California institution of public higher education is learning.

Learning is facilitated by good planning. Too often both higher education and "master planning" have advanced the needs and aspirations of institutions, considering persons largely as abstractions and statistics to be matched with institutional vacancies. We reject

that approach to education and planning.

We are a pluralistic society. Our citizens have diverse learning needs. A primary responsibility of higher education is to respect and complement the individuality of Californians. A primary function of planning is development of an educational system with a broad range of choices available to each person.

To enable California higher education to realize these purposes, we find these objectives critical for the next decade:

1. Academic freedom and responsibility;
2. Equal and universal accessibility for persons of both sexes and all races, ancestries, incomes, ages and geographies;
3. Lifelong learning opportunities for persons with capacity and motivation to benefit;
4. Diversity of institutions, services and methods;
5. Flexibility to adapt to the changing needs of students and society;
6. Cooperation between institutions in assessing area educational needs and resources, and meeting those needs;
7. Involvement with local communities in providing educational services and utilizing community resources in the educational process;
8. Increased understanding of the learning process - to be sought and applied throughout higher education;
9. Discovery of qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods for learning, research and teaching;

10. Accountability throughout higher education, including-

    - accountability of institutions to the individual (for instruction and related services)

    - accountability of institutions to the public and its representatives

    - accountability of the individual (faculty, student, staff) to the institutions

    - accountability of the public and its leaders to the institutions (for support and development).

California has no statement of goals for higher education. But policy-making, coordination and planning are necessarily the expression of assumptions, at least implicit, about purposes and objectives. To facilitate acting consistently and responsibly, the Legislature should adopt a statement of statewide goals for California postsecondary education.

RECOMMENDATION

1. The Legislature shall adopt a statement of legislative intent articulating broad statewide goals for California postsecondary education.

CHAPTER II

STRUCTURE

Present Organization

California public higher education consists of three systems (segments) organized along functional lines.* This functional organization - commonly known as "differentiation of function" - was the basis of the 1960 Master Plan set forth by the Donahoe Act in the Education Code.

The differentiated functions are essentially a set of limitations upon the community colleges and the California State University and Colleges. The community colleges are restricted to offering vocational, collegiate and general instruction through the 14th grade. The California State University and Colleges are to offer undergraduate education and a variety of advanced training through the Master's Degree. The University of California also provides undergraduate instruction and has exclusive jurisdiction over the doctorate, certain types of professional training and most research.

The rationale for assigning specific roles to each segment was to regulate competition among institutions

---

*The segments are the University of California, the California State University and Colleges, and the California Community Colleges.

trying to achieve comprehensive collegiate or university status. Such competition, if left unregulated during a period of enormous growth, would have resulted in duplication of effort.

Another rationale implicit in the Master Plan is that institutions performing similar functions should be grouped together for purposes of governance and administration. This grouping was expected to be both educationally productive and cost effective.

Criticism of Present Organization

The most telling criticism of the California system is its fragmentation of responsibility which has led to a critical absence of state-wide coordination, planning and policy development.*

Nearly as important, the current organization focuses the attention and energies of the segments on identifying and protecting functional differences, rather than on searching out areas and means of cooperation for more efficient achievement of common functions. At our committee hearings leaders of California higher education seemed more interested in institutional and segmental self-sufficiency than in coordination of educational services to benefit the people of California.

*See Chapter IV

Institutional isolation and self-sufficiency is neither educationally nor economically sound. California's systems of higher education must be viewed as a total resource to the state as a whole, and to each area in the state. Excessive emphasis upon institutional prerogatives and boundaries is a major barrier to maximizing the quality and quantity of education available to the people.

A closely related problem, particularly relevant to the University of California and the California State University and Colleges, is the tendency toward uniformity within these systems. Colleges and universities tend to be responsive to their segment rather than to the needs of specified clientele or areas. This tendency is reinforced by uniform administrative and budgetary practices.

Within some campuses and segments, there are differing structural arrangements such as cluster colleges. But the diversity is more form than substance. The potential for diversity is greatly undermined by standardized systemwide criteria for selection, retention and promotion of faculty. We find a disturbing lack of diversity within segments, with a tendency for most campuses to model themselves after a few prestigious

institutions. High quality does not depend upon mechanical application of standardized criteria, whether the issue is institutional mission, budgeting, delivery of instruction, administrative staffing or selection of faculty. Diversification within segments is as important as differentiation between segments.

Alternatives Considered

The Joint Committee evaluated several structural alternatives to the current organization of California higher education. Like the present structure, each of these offers advantages and disadvantages. We considered two basic alternatives to the existing arrangement, each with several variations.

The first alternative is consolidation. This model would incorporate all public higher education under one statewide governing board. Or it might consolidate the University of California and the California State University and Colleges, leaving the community colleges locally controlled. The board could be imposed over existing boards, or it could replace them. Institutions of higher education might be grouped under the board on the present segmental basis or on a regional basis. This approach would deal dramatically with the critical problem of fragmentation of responsibility for policy, planning and coordination. It would probably diminish

institutional barriers and boundaries, particularly if regional subunits were established.

However, the segments in their present form may already be too large to be manageable. Consolidation would probably accelerate unhealthy trends toward centralization, bureaucratic rigidity and distance between the place of decision-making and institutional clientele. It might also rekindle aspirations of some institutions and their communities for comprehensive college or university status.

The second alternative is elimination of multi-campus sytems. This alternative would make each institution autonomous under its own governing board. It would eliminate many of the disturbing trends toward centralization of authority in system offices with large administrative staffs. It could well facilitate diversity, especially by putting decision-making power much closer to persons thereby affected.

However, cohesive statewide policy and planning would be more difficult. There would be near anarchy in the budgetary process, with each college and university dealing directly with the Governor, Department of Finance and Legislature. The dissolution of multi-campus systems would also remove the barriers to un-

controlled institutional aspirations for upward mobility.

Conclusions

No structural arrangement can insure enlightened policies. Structural change of the magnitude required to reorganize a system as large and complex as California higher education would require enormous energy, time and resources. Such change would only be justified if it would produce more effective educational services for the people of California.

The basic issue before the Joint Committee was whether California public higher education can achieve the goals set forth earlier without a major structural overhaul.

We have repeatedly been assured that higher education as now structured can meet these challenges. We accept that assurance only conditionally. We conclude that the current structure can serve to meet California's goals only if two essential conditions are fulfilled:

- Major modifications must be made within the present organizational structure as proposed in this report;

- Educational leadership must be responsive to the public interest as well as to institutional needs.

It is critical that those educational leaders who have assured us of the present structure's capacity for

flexibility and responsiveness work to insure the adoption and implementation of the needed modifications. The coming years will vigorously test that flexibility and responsiveness. Should the educational system prove unable, or its leadership unwilling to respond to new goals and new policies, structural reorganization would be the next logical step.

In retaining the differentiation of function principle, we reaffirm the University of California's mission as "the primary state supported agency for research." However, we are not convinced that every member of the University of California faculty should be funded at every point in his or her career as a half-time or more researcher. We believe the University should provide for the pursuit of excellence in both teaching and research. Certainly a good teacher must be current in his field. But there is not necessarily a correlation between excellence in teaching and excellence in published research. There should be a place in the University for a variety of faculty roles and provisions for faculty to alternate roles at different stages of their careers.

We likewise reaffirm the vital teaching mission of the California State University and Colleges. The recent attainment of University status ought and does

not imply any change in mission. We are alarmed to find publication requirements imposed upon faculty in some departments on some campuses as a condition of employment, promotion and tenure.

RECOMMENDATIONS

2. The University of California shall be the primary academic agency for research. It may provide instruction in the liberal arts and sciences and in the professions of law, medicine, dentistry and veterinary medicine. It shall have the sole authority in public higher education to award the doctoral degree in all fields of learning, except that it may agree with the California State University and Colleges to award joint doctoral degrees in selected fields.

3. The primary function of the California State University and Colleges shall be the provision of instruction for undergraduate students and graduate students - through the Master's degree - in liberal arts and sciences, in applied fields and in the professions. Two-year programs in agriculture are authorized subject to the provisions of the Donahoe Act. The doctoral degree may be awarded jointly with the University of California or with a private institution of post-secondary education accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, provided the program is authorized through the procedures established for new program approval.* Faculty research is authorized to the extent that it is consistent with the primary function of the California State University and Colleges and the facilities provided for that function.

* See Recommendation #21(g)

4. Public community colleges shall offer instruction through but not beyond the 14th grade level. This instruction may include but shall not be limited to programs in one or more of the following categories: (1) standard collegiate courses for transfer to other institutions; (2) vocational and technical fields leading to employment; and (3) general or liberal arts courses. Studies in these fields may lead to the Associate in Arts or the Associate in Science degree.

5. Differentiation of segmental function shall not preclude intersegmental cooperation when such cooperation can: (1) enhance the achievement of the institutional missions shared by the segments; (2) enable public and private postsecondary education to more effectively meet the educational needs of a geographic region; and (3) provide more effective planning of postsecondary education on a statewide basis.

6. The University of California and the California State University and Colleges should extend the principle of differentiation to campuses within their systems. The four-year segments should develop missions for their several campuses with more specificity and delineation than "general campus" and "statewide program."

CHAPTER III

GOVERNANCE

Primary responsibility for governing California's large public systems of higher education resides in lay governing boards. The functions of the boards include providing leadership and protecting both academic freedom and the public interest.

Governing boards have had a key role in the development of California public higher education. These boards are the Regents of the University of California, the Trustees of the California State University and Colleges, the locally elected boards of the community college districts, and the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges.

In the decades ahead, governing boards will be faced with critical decisions of educational policy. It will be more important than ever that board members be highly competent and have credibility with the many constituencies of higher education - including the public, elected officials, students, faculty and alumni.

The Joint Committee finds many of the provisions regarding the composition and appointment of governing boards inadequate for the present and the future. They were designed in the late nineteenth century and

sufficed for an era in which higher education served a smaller, more homogeneous clientele and utilized fewer public resources.

New times call for new approaches. California has a more educated and informed citizenry. About seventy percent of the state's high school graduates go on to higher education. Colleges are expected to serve rich and poor, young and old, men and women, and people of all colors. A changed and changing society has new and divergent educational needs. Our state invests vast resources in its systems of higher education. Those systems have undergone tremendous growth and are highly visible to the state and nation. If higher education is to be responsive to the diverse needs of a pluralistic society, those who govern must be drawn from diverse backgrounds.

Appointments

Except for the members serving in an ex officio capacity, all members of the governing boards are appointed by a single person, the governor, subject only to Senate confirmation.* No matter who has been

---

*The Board of Regents consists of sixteen appointed and eight ex officio members; the Board of Trustees consists of sixteen appointed and five ex officio members; the Board of Governors consists of fifteen appointed members.

governor or what his party, many appointees have been influential supporters or friends of the governor who appointed them. A governor naturally tends to appoint persons who share his ideology. The typical appointee to a California governing board has been white, male, at least middle-aged, well-educated and very successful financially. Since each person is largely affected by his own experience, the result - despite sincerity, ability and goodwill - is uniformity rather than diversity.

We must, of course, strive to have our most qualified citizens serving on governing boards. But competence is not the monopoly of any one class or group. The Regents, Trustees, and members of the Board of Governors should better reflect the population of California with respect to their wealth, sex, ethnic background and age.

In short, our present selection method does not assure diversity, or adequate independence from partisan political currents. The Joint Committee has reviewed alternatives to exclusive gubernatorial selection utilized by other states, popular election (Illinois and Michigan), selection by the legislature (North Carolina), and appointment by constituent groups (Pennsylvania). None of these alternatives seems appropriate to California.

The most effective course of action for California is creation of a broadly representative commission which presents the governor with a list of nominations for each vacancy. The governor then appoints from among those recommended. Senate confirmation is eliminated. All participants in the nominating and appointing process should be charged with assuring that governing boards are broadly and equitably representative of the people of California.

This proposal advances the causes of diversity, legitimacy, and insulation from partisanship while retaining the ultimate appointment authority in the hands of the governor. It is patterned after a recent proposal for appointments to the judiciary and is an appropriate mechanism for selecting persons for positions of great public trust who are not responsible to the people through the election process.

Terms of Office

The Regents currently serve sixteen-year terms, the Trustees serve for eight years and the members of the Board of Governors, four years. The Joint Committee finds no rationale in public or educational policy for different terms.

One argument often advanced in favor of sixteen-year terms is that they guarantee the board's insulation from partisan influence. However, revising the appointment process would provide better protection than excessively long terms.

Sixteen years does not guarantee that a two-term governor cannot exercise inordinate influence over a board. There are sixteen appointed members and eight ex officio members of the Board of Regents. In addition to the Governor, three other ex officio regents (Lieutenant Governor, Speaker of the Assembly, and Superintendent of Public Instruction) are popularly elected. These regents are often members of the same political party as the governor and are likely to follow his leadership. When they are combined with the number of gubernatorial appointees shown in the table below, the alleged protection proves illusory.

TABLE I

Governor	Term	Regental Appointments
Culbert L. Olson	1939-1943	9
Earl Warren	1943-1953	15
Goodwin Knight	1953-1959	10
Edmund Brown	1959-1967	13
Ronald Reagan	1967-1972	9
	1967-1975*	11

*Terms of two regents will expire by 1974.

Another contention is that lengthy terms are required for board members to develop sufficient knowledge and expertise. However, the Joint Committee notes that the last four chairmen of the Board have been chosen by the Regents within four years of their initial appointments.

TABLE II

Regents	Appointed To Board	Served as Chairman of Board
Theodore R. Meyer	1962	1966-68
Dewitt A. Higgs	1966	1968-70
William F. Smith	1968	1970-72
Dean A. Watkins	1969	1972-Present

In determining the proper length of service, we deemed the following considerations most important:

- terms should be long enough to encourage a depth of knowledge and expertise; and
- terms should be short enough to allow for the frequent appointment of new members.

The length of service for each governing board should be the same. While there is no perfect term, eight years is sufficient to meet the above criteria. Our decision is influenced by the experience of the California State University and Colleges. We find no evidence this board is less effective than the Regents.

Composition

A governing board must have credibility with its constituency. In higher education students and faculty are a part of that constituency. Therefore, one student and one faculty member, each peer-selected, should be added to the three statewide boards and each community college district board. They would not vote but should have the right of full participation in all sessions.

Student and faculty representatives already participate in governance at many levels and have frequently taken part in meetings of governing boards. This involvement has generally enhanced board deliberations. The time has come to formalize and guarantee the participation of these groups.*

The Joint Committee has weighed the pros and cons of retaining the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Superintendent of Public Instruction, and Speaker of the Assembly as ex officio members of the boards. We believe there is value in some members being directly responsible to the people of California; on the other hand, there is risk of politicizing governing boards by their presence. Absent a clearly better alternative, we make no recommendation for change.

*In June, 1972, the United States Congress enacted the higher education amendments which included the following statement: "It is the sense of Congress that the governing boards of institutions of higher education give consideration to student participation on such boards."

Alumni representatives serve on governing boards with unique insight and understanding. They have no vested interest except in the welfare of the institution. Noting the contributions of alumni regents to the University of California, we believe alumni would serve valuably on the other statewide boards.

We find no justification for the special interest representation of the Mechanics Institute and the State Board of Agriculture on the Board of Regents. All members should represent the public-at-large.

Conflict of Interest and Disclosure

Public confidence requires that persons serving on governing boards be above reproach and that they be perceived by the public as above reproach. Appropriate conflict of interest and disclosure provisions are needed.

Constitutional Status and Autonomy

The Joint Committee does not wish to alter the fundamental relationships between the state and the two statewide and state-supported systems of higher education.

The University of California is a constitutional entity. The California Constitution does more than

grant recognition. In essence, it establishes the University as a separate branch of government. It gives the Board of Regents full powers of governance subject only to specified limitations.

However, there are at times overriding issues of statewide concern involving California's total higher education effort. While the Joint Committee does not propose fundamental change in the responsibilities and powers of the Regents, it notes two exceptions justified by the need for coordinated statewide policies: admissions policies* and student charges.**

The California State University and Colleges should have constitutional recognition. However, the powers of the Trustees should continue to be determined and delegated by the Legislature. Constitutional recognition will affirm that both statewide systems are held in equal status by the State of California.

The Regents and Trustees should continue to exercise their current governance responsibilities except as otherwise specified in this report.

Multicampus Systems

A major but largely unrecognized trend of the last

---

* See Chapter V
**See Chapter IX

decade has been the concentration of large numbers of campuses under central administrative offices. In California, under the Master Plan, the two statewide four-year systems have grown enormously.

The multicampus systems have contributed to the orderly growth of public higher education - particularly in the areas of planning, resource allocation, and the achievement of economies of scale. However, they have also added considerable bureaucratic apparatus to higher education. Despite significant efforts to decentralize, there is still a preponderance of administrative centralization.

There is currently no evidence available on the optimum size of multicampus systems. Unfortunately, neither statewide segment has addressed this subject in an analytical way. The Joint Committee recognizes this as an extremely complex problem with many variables. Yet policy-makers in higher education and state government must learn about the impact of size in order to make rational decisions about such issues as governance, administration and structure. We can no longer afford an uncritical attitude towards growth and expansion.

Decentralization of Governance

We believe the University of California, the Cali-

fornia State University and Colleges and the large multicampus community college districts should undertake controlled experiments in decentralization of governance.

One approach would be the creation of local boards with final authority over such matters as campus architecture (design only), buildings and grounds, and personnel. The local board's concurrence might also be required in the appointment of a campus chief executive. In addition, the local board could serve as a liaison between campus and community. It is important that local boards' authority be delegated by the governing boards and not taken from administrative powers now held by campus chief executives.

Local boards could free the energies of segmental boards from parochial matters and enable them to focus more intensively on issues of systemwide policy. Boards with enormous responsibilities too frequently bog down with matters better decided locally.

Local boards which are only advisory cannot effectively serve as more than public relations and fund-raising bodies. Such boards have sometimes been effective in accomplishing limited objectives, but they have not served to place important decisions closer to the persons affected by them.

We suggest each system of three campuses or more, experiment on several selected campuses with local governing boards and, if necessary, that they seek appropriate legislation to enable the formation of such boards.

There are many ways local boards could be selected; however, we suggest that they combine representation from the campus, the local community, and the state-at-large (for campuses which serve the entire state).

RECOMMENDATIONS

7. The Board of Regents of the University of California and the Board of Trustees of the California State University and Colleges shall each consist of twenty-two voting members and two non-voting members.

   a) The Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Speaker of the Assembly, and Superintendent of Public Instruction shall continue to be members of both boards.

   b) The President of the University of California and the Chancellor of the California State University and Colleges shall continue to be members of their respective boards.

   c) An alumni representative shall continue to serve on the Board of Regents and shall be added to the Board of Trustees.

   d) Sixteen public members shall be appointed in accordance with Recommendation #9.

   e) A peer-selected faculty member and peer-selected student shall be non-voting members, with the right of full participation in all sessions.

f) The representation of the Mechanics Institute and the State Board of Agriculture on the Board of Regents shall be eliminated.

8. The Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges shall consist of seventeen voting members and two non-voting members.

   a) Sixteen public members shall be appointed in accordance with Recommendation #9.

   b) One alumni representative shall be added to the board as a voting member.

   c) A peer-selected faculty member and peer-selected student shall be non-voting members with the right of full participation in all sessions.

9. Appointed governing board members of the three segments of higher education shall be selected by the Governor from a list of five to ten persons submitted for each vacancy by a nominating committee.

   a) The nominating committee shall be composed of:

      (1) the Chief Justice of the California Supreme Court (Chairman)

      (2) the Speaker and Minority Leader of the Assembly

      (3) the President Pro-Tem and Minority Leader of the Senate

      (4) the chairman of each segmental governing board

      (5) an alumni representative from each segment

      (6) a peer-selected faculty member from each segment

      (7) a peer-selected student from each segment

b) Committee members designated in a)4-7 above shall vote only on nominations for their own segmental board.

10. Senate confirmation of governing board members shall be eliminated.

11. Governing boards shall be broadly and equitably representative of the general public including ethnic minorities and women.

12. Terms of appointed Regents, Trustees, and members of the Board of Governors shall be eight years.

13. The Legislature shall provide conflict of interest and disclosure provisions for members of segmental governing boards.

14. A non-voting student and faculty member shall be added to the governing board of each community college district. These representatives shall be peer-selected and shall have the right of full participation in all sessions.

15. The fundamental relationships between state government and the University of California and the California State University and Colleges shall be maintained.

    a) The constitutional autonomy of the University of California shall be preserved. The powers of the Regents shall remain as now specified in the California constitution except with respect to admissions policies* and student charges.**

    b) Constitutional recognition shall be extended to the California State University and Colleges. The powers of the Board of Trustees shall remain the same and shall continue to be determined by the Legislature.

---

* See Recommendation #36
** See Recommendation #49

16. The Legislature should suggest that the University of California, the California State University and Colleges and community college districts with three or more campuses conduct pilot experiments with local governing boards.

CHAPTER IV

COORDINATION AND PLANNING

Coordination is the critical element in a multi-system organization of postsecondary education. California needs an independent agency capable of articulating statewide needs and providing advice to the segments and elected public policy-makers. This agency must have the responsibility and authority to coordinate so as to avoid unnecessary duplication and to foster diversity.

Comprehensive planning is the most crucial aspect of coordination, since it provides the basis for all other functions of coordination. Effective statewide planning should:

- optimize the use of resources
- assure diversity of institutions and programs
- provide for systematic development of new approaches and delivery systems
- maximize informed student choice within limited resources
- maintain policy options for the future
- identify and respond to future educational and societal needs.

The planning required for the decades ahead must be qualitative as well as quantitative, concerned with ends as well as means of postsecondary education. It must avoid the pitfall of mechanically extrapola-

ting present trends and assumptions into the future, thus locking postsecondary education into patterns which may be neither relevant nor economically sound.

We need an integrated planning process which will take all our educational resources and present and projected future needs into account. Planning should be statewide, regional and segmental. It should be a continuous process, rather than a permanent plan only periodically reviewed.

The Federal Education Amendments of 1972 recognize this, and provide for establishment of state postsecondary education commissions with responsibility for statewide planning. Under this legislation such a commission is required to qualify a state for federal assistance. The major thrust is that state planning must encompass all of postsecondary education. The commission must be:

> Broadly and equitably representative of the general public and of public and private, nonprofit and proprietary institutions of higher education - including community colleges, junior colleges, postsecondary vocational schools, area vocational schools, technical institutes, four-year institutions of higher education and branches thereof.

The legislation also requires designation of a state agency to administer occupational education plans developed by the state postsecondary education commission.

The Situation

The principal systemic deficiencies of our segmental organization are inadequate coordination and planning.

Short of the Governor and the Legislature, no agency has the capacity to coordinate and develop comprehensive higher education policies for the state. After more than a decade under the celebrated Master Plan, California has no comprehensive state plan, no statewide planning process, and no comprehensive information system to provide policy-makers with accurate and comparable data on programs, costs, and flow of students.

Regional planning is non-existent, except in a few highly specialized instances. Limited planning has occurred at the segmental level. Not surprisingly, its concern has been primarily with segmental interests and aspirations. Without a coordinated state approach, segmental planning can only be fragmentary and cannot assure quality and quantity of educational services to the people of California. In times of abundant resources such fragmentation may go unnoticed. In times of scarce resources, as the state needs to maximize educational opportunities and benefits, it is intolerable.

The "master plan" concept is no longer useful. It implies a rigidity which undermines the flexibility necessary for adaptation to changing needs of students and society. It tends to foreclose future options at the time we need most to enhance them. In times of increasingly rapid change, any predetermined "plan" is by nature too static, and we need instead a continuous planning process.

Such a process necessarily includes periodic long-range planning and a mechanism capable of on-going planning. Long-range planning should include a periodic evaluation of the fundamental goals and assumptions of public postsecondary education, its organization, governance and planning mechanisms, and the functions of all institutions, segments and agencies. It should occur every ten years through a public process involving lay persons, students, faculty and administrators. It should be conducted by the Legislature.

The on-going planning process should involve the public segments and institutions and, when appropriate, private institutions of postsecondary education and interested state agencies involved in postsecondary education. It should be concerned with implementation of long-range goals (such as those proposed in Chapter I), projections of enrollments and costs, programmatic

needs, budget formulae, management systems and other vital subjects.

The Solution

California must have a suitably sensitive mechanism to provide the necessary coordination and continuous planning and to meet federal requirements.

Four basic approaches to statewide coordination of postsecondary education have been utilized in the United States:

- voluntary coordination: without a state mandate, institutions voluntarily come together and cooperate
- advisory coordination: a coordinating board established by statute, with purely advisory functions
- regulatory coordination: a board, commonly designated as a commission, with broad regulatory powers to plan and to approve specified policies and programs, but without administrative responsibility (except over federal programs)
- superboard: a single statewide board which both coordinates and governs.

A dozen years ago voluntary cooperation was deemed inadequate for California. It is even less desirable now.

At that time California chose and has since utilized advisory coordination - the Coordinating Council for

Higher Education. However, with its powers, duties and composition, the Council is inadequate for our future. In fact, the Council was never intended to fulfill the functions of planning and policy development and never equipped to do effective statewide coordination. The Master Plan Survey Team (composed of institutional representatives) proposed that membership of the Council be entirely institutional representatives. It explicitly provided that the director and staff of the Council were not to be "leaders of higher education."[1]

In creating the Council the Legislature added three public members, and more recently restructured it with a majority of public members. This has added somewhat to its effectiveness. Yet throughout the Council's history the segments have dominated it; its director and staff have not been selected from among educational leaders; and it has not gained the necessary credibility. There is little indication the Council can become the effective instrument needed for coordination and planning.

Because of the University of California's constitutional autonomy, the Council must rely on voluntary cooperation. Granting it has had some success in negotiating agreements, their voluntary nature renders such agreements fragile and subject to conflicting interpretations by the segments.

In summary, the history of the Council has demonstrated that advisory coordination will not work in California.

At the other end of the spectrum is the superboard. Several states have moved or are moving in this direction. But we are not convinced a superboard is best for California. Postsecondary education in California is already too bureaucratic. The number and size of our postsecondary educational institutions makes consolidation and centralization undesirable.

We conclude, therefore, that regulatory coordination will best serve California.

The regulatory agency model leaves the segmental structure intact. Governing powers remain with the segmental governing boards and there is no centralization of governing authority. Rather it provides a commission with sufficient authority to conduct continuous comprehensive statewide planning and to provide credible and independent advice to the Governor and the Legislature. Its effectiveness depends not upon its power to govern, but upon the quality of its advice.

There are clear and crucial distinctions between the regulatory model and a superboard. A consolidated governing board has full responsibility for governance and administration of the institutions under its

jurisdiction including policy initiation and personnel management; a regulatory commission does not.

A regulatory commission does require some subordination of segmental and institutional prerogatives in the interests of overall state educational policy.

An effective coordinating board must occupy the middle ground between the postsecondary education community and state government. If it fails to effectively perform its sensitive missions, a vacuum is created. Such a vacuum invites and even necessitates assumption of the coordinating role by the Governor and Legislature, as well as more drastic structural reform.

In short, effective coordination and planning require high quality educational leadership. The proposals offered here provide a structure and environment for such leadership. But the crucial ingredient - academic statesmanship which places the common good above parochial interests - must come from California's postsecondary education community.

The responsibilities of a regulatory postsecondary education commission should include:

- continuous and comprehensive statewide planning
- coordination of public and private postsecondary education
- administration of federal programs channeled through state government
- approval of changes in admissions policies of

public segments or institutions therein *

- encouragement of interinstitutional cooperation and consortia, particularly on a regional basis
- determination of need for new campuses
- review of any proposed new unit of instruction, research or public service
- initiation and coordination of segmental reviews of existing programs.

The Commission should have constitutional status, to guarantee parity in stature with the segments it regulates. To assure maximum flexibility, provisions for its functions, membership and powers should be statutory. The Commission must have power to obtain all necessary information from the segments, and to require it in forms allowing comparability of data. So that it may provide educational leadership, its professional staff should be exempt from civil service regulations (as are the staffs of the University of California and the California State University and Colleges.)

In order to facilitate the proximity and inter-relationships critical to effective coordination and planning, the Commission and the central office of each public segment should be located in Sacramento.

To be an effective planning and coordination agency, the Commission must enjoy the confidence of

---

* See Chapter V.

the legislative and executive branches of state government, as well as the institutions and segments of postsecondary education. The best way to assure the former is to share the public appointments between the two branches of government. The best way to assure the latter is to include representatives of all types of postsecondary educational institutions.

The Postsecondary Education Commission should have a clear majority of public members whose primary commitment is to the citizenry of California and the quality of education, rather than to particular institutions. It should be composed entirely of lay persons. Hence the institutional representatives should be members of segmental governing boards rather than administrative officers. The responsibility of board members is primarily to the public. They can better serve the dual role of public and institutional representatives, and their presence on the Commission will provide valuable liaison with the governing boards.

Rather than serving on the Commission itself, segmental chief executives should constitute one of several committees advisory to the Commission. Other committees should include professional educators and students.

Finally, the Legislature, as a vital link in providing postsecondary education for Californians, also needs special competence. Especially with increasing federal involvement, expertise on higher education policy matters must be readily available within the Legislature. Additionally, such expertise would enhance the Legislature's capacity to sensitively fulfill its responsibility.

RECOMMENDATIONS

17. The "master plan" approach shall be abandoned in favor of a continuous planning process which includes:

    a) Legislative guidelines regarding goals, social needs and general missions of the segments

    b) Continuous planning by a postsecondary education commission

    c) Reevaluation of the planning process at ten-year intervals by the Legislature.

18. The Coordinating Council for Higher Education shall be abolished.

19. There shall be a Postsecondary Education Commission created, with constitutional status.

    a) The Legislature shall have broad powers to determine the membership, powers and functions of the Commission.

    b) Members of the Commission shall not be employees of any institution of postsecondary education.

c) The Commission shall be selected so as to be broadly and equitably representative of the population at large.

d) The professional staff of the Commission shall be exempt from civil service regulations.

20. The Commission shall be composed of:

a) Twelve (12) public members:

(1) six appointed by the Governor for six-year terms

(2) three appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly for six-year terms

(3) three appointed by the Senate Rules Committee for six-year terms

b) Seven institutional representatives:

(1) the Chairman of the University of California Board of Regents or a regent designated by him

(2) the Chairman of the California State University and Colleges Board of Trustees or a trustee designated by him

(3) the Chairman of the California Community Colleges Board of Governors or a member designated by him

(4) a representative of non-profit independent higher education, appointed by the Governor for a six-year term, upon the advice of an organization representative of those institutions

(5) the Chairman of the State Board of Education or a member designated by him

(6) the Chairman of the California Advisory Council on Vocational Education and Technical Training

(7) a representative of proprietary education, appointed by the Governor for a six-year term, upon the advice of an organization representative of those institutions.

21. The Postsecondary Education Commission shall have these functions:

a) Prepare a five-year state plan for postsecondary education; this plan shall integrate the planning efforts of the public segments as well as regional plans. Conflicts or inconsistencies among segmental plans shall be resolved by the Commission in consultation with the segments. If such consultations are unsuccessful, the Commission shall report the unresolved issues to the Legislature with recommendations for resolution.

b) Update the state plan annually

c) Report annually to the legislative and executive branches as to whether segmental operating and capital budgetary requests are compatible with the state plan

d) Act as the official state clearinghouse for postsecondary education information and as the primary source of information for the Legislature, the Governor and other agencies, and develop a comprehensive data base insuring comparability of data from diverse sources

e) Require the public institutions of postsecondary education to submit data on matters pertinent to effective planning and coordination

f) Establish criteria for state support of new and existing programs, in consultation with the public segments, the Department of Finance and the Legislative Analyst

g) Review segmental proposals for new programs and make recommendations regarding funding to the Legislature (The Legislature shall adopt a statement of intent not to fund new programs unless favorably reviewed by the Commission.)

h) Establish a schedule for review of existing programs (certain "core" and experimental programs may be exempted by mutual consent), in consultation with the segments; evaluate the program review processes of the segments, and report to the Legislature

i) Determine the need for and location of new campuses of public higher education (The Legislature shall not authorize or acquire sites for new institutions of higher education unless recommended by the Commission.)

j) Approve changes in admissions policies of the University of California and the California State University and Colleges and of individual campuses within those segments (The Legislature shall assume control over admissions policies of all segments and delegate this control to the Commission.*)

k) Develop criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of all aspects of postsecondary education, whenever possible basing evaluation criteria upon qualitative and quantitative programmatic outcomes

l) Maintain a current inventory of all off-campus programs and facilities for education, research or community service operated by public and private institutions of postsecondary education

m) Conduct studies of projected manpower supply and demand, in cooperation with appropriate state agencies; disseminate the results of such studies to public and private institutions of postsecondary education

---

*See Recommendation #36

n) Prepare and transmit to the Legislature a plan for the formulation of regional postsecondary education councils throughout California *

o) Serve as a stimulus to the segments and institutions of postsecondary education by projecting and identifying segmental and educational needs and encouraging adaptability to change

p) Develop and periodically review guidelines for adult and continuing higher education

q) Exercise such other responsibilities as are recommended in this report.**

22. The Commission shall be designated the "State Postsecondary Education Commission" under Section 1202 of the Education Amendments of 1972, with the following functions and powers:

a) Comprehensive statewide planning for postsecondary education (all functions and duties delineated in Section 1203 of the Education Amendments of 1972)

b) Statewide planning for and establishment of an advisory council on community colleges (all functions and duties in relation to Title X, A and B of the Education Amendments of 1972)

c) All functions and duties in relation to the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, Titles I and IV as amended, and Title I (Continuing Education) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 as amended

d) Commenting to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare on proposals for the improvement of postsecondary education (the reviewing and recommending functions required by Section 404 (b) of the Education Amendments of 1972)

*See Recommendation #'s 37 & 38
**See Recommendation #'s 33, 40, 41, & 43

e) Affirming when appropriate that an institution of higher education applying for federal emergency assistance is in distress (the functions and duties required of "the appropriate State agency" as designated in Section 122 (b) (2) of the Education Amendments of 1972).

23. The Commission shall be designated the agency responsible for fiscal management and administration of federal aid for community colleges and occupational education under Section 1055 of the Education Amendments of 1972.

a) This agency shall be charged with the sole administration of the plans for occupational education developed by the 1202 Commission (Title X-B).

b) To aid in the administrative and fiscal duties imposed by Title X-B on the 1055 agency, the Commission should establish a panel of such persons from the postsecondary community as it deems appropriate. (Section 1055 requires the continued use of the existing State Advisory Council on Vocational Education with the same responsibilities as provided in the Vocational Education Act of 1963).

24. The Postsecondary Education Commission and central offices of all public segments of postsecondary education shall be located in Sacramento.

25. Each house of the Legislature shall improve its policy staff capacity in postsecondary education.

CHAPTER V

ACCESS AND RETENTION

In the 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education, California committed itself to provide a place in higher education to every high school graduate or eighteen-year-old able and motivated to benefit. California became the first state or society in the history of the world to make such a commitment. We reaffirm this pledge.

Unfortunately, our achievements have not met our promises. Though we have made considerable progress in the 1960's and 1970's, equality of opportunity in post-secondary education is still far off. Economic and social conditions and early schooling must be significantly improved before equal opportunity can be realized. But there is much that can be done by and through higher education.

The 1960 Master Plan specified that relative high school academic achievement, as defined by each segment, would determine access to the University of California (top 12½%) and the California State Colleges (top 33 1/3%). Prior to the Master Plan the University accepted its students from about the top 15%, and the state colleges from approximately the top 50%. The Master Plan allowed 2% exceptions per year in freshman admissions. This was

raised to 4% in 1968, with at least half the exceptions reserved solely for disadvantaged students.

The Master Plan also specified that community colleges should continue to admit any high school graduate and other person over eighteen years of age capable of profiting from the instruction offered. The Master Plan Survey Team decided that:

> so long as any high school graduate can be admitted to a junior college, it will not reduce opportunity for students willing and able to meet the requirements for transfer to the upper division in the state colleges and the University of California.[1]

The intent of the authors of the Master Plan was to raise admissions standards in the four-year institutions and thereby divert 50,000 students to the community colleges. They believed this would raise the quality (apparently equated with selectivity) of the four-year colleges and universities.

The Master Plan Survey Team left no comprehensive record of [illegible] assumptions underlying its admissions quotas. However, our analysis of the Master Plan and supporting documents suggests the following assumptions were implicit:

- institutional aspirations for greater selectivity should be encouraged
- the specific quotas (12½% and 33 1/3%) could be justified by matching institutional and fiscal resources with projected demands (though rigorous evidence was lacking)

- efficiency in education could best be realized by separating students on the basis of academic ability as conventionally defined (high school) grades, class standing and test scores)

- the quality of an educational institution is highly correlated with the quality (again measured by conventional standards) of the students admitted

- the "best" students should have the greatest range of educational options and should receive the "best" education (in terms of dollars spent per student and prestige of the institution)

- segregation of students by ability would minimize dropout rates in the four-year, more expensive institutions

- students begin college immediately upon completion of high school.

Several of these assumptions are at least questionable today. The most serious criticism is that the assumptions were dictated by institutional aspirations rather than by individual needs or any well-articulated educational philosophy.

In addition, there is a growing body of educational research which indicates that the most selective colleges have the least effect on students. Highly selective institutions make only a slight difference in the student's college achievements (academic and extracurricular), academic ability, likelihood of completing college, level of education achieved and choice of career. There is almost no empirical basis for the contention that segregating students by ability, as measured by high school achievement,

is educationally more effective than other approaches. Neither is there evidence that the standard instruments for predicting college success (grades and standardized tests) are the best possible measures of academic potential. In California the success of specially admitted students raises serious questions about exclusive reliance upon conventional predictive criteria.

In short, we know very little about how to match students with institutions which meet their educational needs and capabilities. The most critical element is probably motivation, which is also the most difficult quality to measure. As a spokesman for the California State University and Colleges put it: "Studies involving the predictive power of various pre-admissions indices show that in general there has been little improvement made over the past 50 years."[2] We do know that the criteria currently in effect are very highly correlated with ethnic and economic background.

Finally, we note the trend towards defining and utilizing educational outcomes as a basis for evaluation (and financing) of higher education. This makes it questionable whether institutions which accept and graduate the students most likely to succeed (and spend more dollars per student) should be regarded as the "best". As one educational researcher recently put it, "...the best

way to graduate a bright class is to admit a bright class".[3] But what does this say for the impact of the institution?

In the past, high status has too readily and simply been accorded the institutions which admitted only the "best qualified" learners. Perhaps in the future the quality of education will be measured instead in terms of "value added". This would look more at the process of education and take into account what happens to the student between entrance and graduation.

Socioeconomic Barriers to College Attendance

National studies indicate that socioeconomic status is more important than intelligence in determining college attendance. A 1968 study of 10,000 high school graduates in the lowest 40% ability distribution showed that if the student had a father of high level occupation, there was a 57% chance he would attend college; if the student had a father of low level occupation, there was a 20% chance he would attend college.[4] Socioeconomic status was found to be particularly important in determining college attendance patterns for women.

In California, persons from low-income families are significantly underrepresented in public higher education.

As indicated in Table III, there is a clear correlation between family income and the segment of California higher education a student attends. The average family income for a University of California student is $15,160 (nearly the family income for the average student attending a private institution), for a California State University and College student $12,330, and a California Community College student $11,420. (See Table III).

Barriers Related to Ethnic Background

A similar discrepancy is evident with ethnic minorities. Blacks, Mexican-Americans, Asians and Native Americans represent 32.3% of the state's population. However, they comprise only 20.9% of the enrollment in the California Community Colleges, 16.2% in the California State University and Colleges, and 14.7% in the University of California. (See Table IV).

It is evident that individuals of low-income minority groups suffer from double discrimination.

An Invisible Barrier

The ultimate objective of any admissions policy is to enable the student to attend the institution best suited to his or her interests and abilities. Informed

TABLE III

1971 INCOME OF PARENTS OF RESPONDENTS*
GRADUATES AND UNDERGRADUATES - ALL SEGMENTS

WHAT WAS THE APPROX. 1971 INCOME OF YOUR PARENTS OR LEGAL GUARDIAN?	UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA		CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY & COLLEGES		INDEPENDENT COLLEGES		COMMUNITY COLLEGES		TOTAL SAMPLE	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
LESS THAN $3,000	4,011	7.3	4,392	11.1	807	7.4	3,652	12.1	12,862	9.5
$3,000 to $5,999	4,390	8.0	3,911	9.9	761	7.0	3,925	13.1	12,987	9.6
$6,000 to $7,499	3,173	5.8	3,092	7.8	618	5.7	2,979	9.9	9,862	7.3
$7,500 to $8,999	3,315	6.0	3,274	8.3	690	6.3	2,724	9.1	10,003	7.4
$9,000 to $11,999	7,365	13.4	6,949	17.6	1,518	13.9	4,814	16.0	20,646	15.2
$12,000 to $14,999	7,539	13.7	6,065	15.3	1,529	14.0	4,259	14.2	19,392	14.3
$15,000 to $17,999	5,687	10.3	3,760	9.5	1,013	9.3	2,502	8.3	12,962	9.6
$18,000 to $20,999	5,169	9.4	2,868	7.3	993	9.1	1,736	5.8	10,766	7.9
$21,000 to $24,999	4,762	8.6	2,023	5.1	832	7.6	1,380	4.6	8,997	6.6
$25,000 AND ABOVE	9,674	17.6	3,203	8.1	2,148	19.7	2,087	6.9	17,112	12.6

*Source of Data: California Student Resource Survey 1972, Page 193

TABLE IV

Student Enrollment Ethnic Data*

	% of California Population[1]	% of High School Senior Class[2]	% CCC Day Students	% of CSUC[3]	% of UC
Black	12.5	7.3	8.4	4.8	3.6
Mexican - American	16.0	12.1	7.9	5.4	3.2
Asians	2.5	2.5	3.4	5.0	7.3
Native - American	1.3	.4	1.2	1.0	.6
White	67.7	76.9	77.9	83.9	85.2

(1) 1970 Census
(2) Fall 1971
(3) 1970-1971

*Source of Data: Legislative Analyst

student choice plays a crucial role in this process. Sadly, a frequent and almost universal complaint from students throughout California is that information and counseling on college opportunities are seriously deficient. The heavy workload of high school counselors and the increasing complexity of the college admissions and financial aids processes mitigate against informed student choice.

Another obstacle to informed student choice is institutional competition for students. As enrollments level off and even decline, more aggressive recruiting will become common (admissions policies have already been significantly altered when campuses have been threatened with a decline in students and a corresponding decline in funding). Competition for students can be healthy if it provides superior educational services and meets legitimate student needs. However, there is danger such competition will escalate into public relations projects designed to fill institutional capacities without regard for the good of the student. The best protection against such excesses is consumer-oriented counseling.

Geographic Barriers

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education observed

that:

> young people who live in suburban areas are more likely to attend college than those living in inner cities or in non-metropolitan areas, and that those living in the poverty portions of large metropolitan areas are especially unlikely to attend college.[6]

Access problems also exist in rural areas. A recent study which encompassed thirteen northeastern California counties revealed significant unmet desire and demand for postsecondary education services.[7]

Age Barriers

Most educational planning, including projections of financial aids needs, is based upon assumptions about a "college age" population, usually between eighteen and the mid-twenties. Such assumptions create impressions among young people that they should be in college whether or not they have need and motivation; older persons are led to believe there is no place for them in college. Yet the decision about when to attend college should be highly individual. Some people may be ready to benefit from postsecondary education at the age of 17, others would be better served at 45. The Department of Labor estimates that before long the average person will be changing careers three times in a lifetime. This suggests a need for retraining at several ages.

There are indications that older students do better in postsecondary education. The most frequently cited example is the World War II GI's. There is no exhaustive data but some impressions that the same is true of Vietnam and Peace Corps returnees. Yet admissions, financial aids and program development policies continue to focus upon the traditional age group.

Articulation

Significant numbers of community college students transfer to the four-year institutions (see Table V). Perhaps it is more significant that greater numbers do not. In any event, students commonly report difficulty in smoothly making the transfer.

Some students attend a community college initially because of personal, financial or geographic barriers. Smooth transfer to four-year institutions is essential for us to have truly equal opportunity in admissions. Especially as we continue to have large increases in community college enrollments, careful attention to articulation processes is critical.

Particular problems include counseling, adequate information, financial aids, recognition of credits, adequate space, and equal treatment.

TABLE V

Articulation Data - Fall, 1969*

Transfers from California Community Colleges to:

CSUC	28,207	(Total full time equivalent 186,366)
UC	4,450	(Total full time equivalent 104,248)

Evaluation of High School Records

We are concerned about measurements being made too early in life, cutting off a person's chances for higher education. The use of high school records in determining qualification for admission to an institution of higher education should not be inflexible, nor should it penalize a student whose ability develops or is discovered late. We are also concerned that course requirements not be so numerous and specific that they in effect dictate the curriculum of the high schools.

Retention and Attrition

California is a national leader in the proportion and number of high school graduates admitted to some

*Source of Data: Legislative Analyst

type of postsecondary educational institution. However, California is among the lowest in the country in the proportion of students completing college.[8]

The Newman task force on higher education observed in 1971:

> Access alone does not lead to a successful education. It means only the exposure of a particular age group to whatever educational institutions there are, and not the quality of the experience they are likely to find there. When the Task Force looked behind the growth statistics, they were found to mask a major phenomenon: the surprisingly large and growing number of students who voluntarily drop out of college.[9]

It went on to cite a study of the California State University and Colleges which showed that only 13% of entering freshmen graduate in four years from the college they enter. Had they looked at the California Community Colleges, they would have found even more alarming rates of attrition.

Yet we have insufficient information about attrition and its causes. We have found few studies of these students, why they leave higher education institutions, and where or whether they eventually resume their education.

A national study of college dropouts by Alexander W. Astin cited the following as principal predictors of persistence in higher education:[10]

- grades in high school and scores on tests of academic ability

- high degree aspirations at time of college entrance
- financing college education chiefly through and from parents, scholarship or personal savings
- not being employed during the school year
- being male.

By this discussion we do not mean to imply that every student should obtain a degree. The higher education experience may assist many students in deciding to drop out of college to pursue other activities. But participation in higher education for even a brief period is of positive value to both the student and society. Furthermore, there are a number of students who achieve their educational objectives without obtaining a degree, such as those who choose a specific technical or vocational program at community colleges.

The Newman task force has highlighted the social and public policy questions of access and retention:

> We can assume that society fulfills its obligations simply by providing the opportunity for as many as possible to enter college. Success cannot and should not be guaranteed. High dropout rates are not inconsistent with our commitment to broad access, but rather reflect the maintenance of rigorous academic standards and our insistence that a college degree represents real achievement.
>
> Or we can assume that society's obligation (and its own self-interest, as well) is to provide more than just the chance to walk through the college gate - that there must also be access to a useful and personally significant educational experience.

These assumptions are not mutually exclusive. Some dropouts perhaps should never have entered college. Yet

others might have succeeded if the education available had been tailored to their individual needs. Evidence indicates that when an institution attempts to hire faculty and develop curriculum relevant to a specific clientele, the result is greater persistence and higher graduation rates for that clientele.

Integrated Admissions Policies

Any alteration of admissions criteria by one institution or segment will impact on the entire system of postsecondary education. These decisions, therefore, should not be made autonomously. It is necessary to establish some central regulation over these policies to assure overall patterns of equal access, and to prevent unbridled competition for students. Therefore, we propose that the Legislature assume jurisdiction of undergraduate admissions policies for all segments. This authority should be delegated to the Postsecondary Education Commission which would be empowered to approve changes in segmental or institutional admissions policies.

Conclusion

We are concerned with the racial imbalance in public institutions of higher education, especially with the

increase as we move from community colleges through the California State University and Colleges to the University of California. Many persons believe the three-tier system is inherently racist because socioeconomic and cultural conditions in the early experience of minority persons leave them unable to measure up to the admissions standards of the four-year segments.

For that very reason an open admissions system is often suggested, and was considered by the Joint Committee. Such a policy could open up every public institution in all three segments to any high school graduate or 18-year-old seeking admission.

One argument offered in opposition is that such a policy would dilute the quality of our four-year segments. Another is that, in effect, we already have an open admissions policy since there is a place in higher education for every Californian because of the open door policy of the community colleges.

But another reason has influenced our decision regarding a total open admissions policy. There is little evidence that the four-year institutions are more responsive to the learning needs of these students than are the community colleges.

We are concerned lest the community colleges be seen

as convenient places to shepherd the "less qualified" learners, or become places where their aspirations are cooled. Hopefully, every institution of higher education in California will strive always to facilitate each student's learning to the very fullest of his or her potential.

RECOMMENDATIONS

26. The Legislature shall reaffirm the commitment of the State of California to provide an appropriate place in California public higher education for every student willing and able to benefit from attendance.

27. A major goal of California for the remainder of the 1970's shall be to insure that considerations of quality early schooling, ethnic grouping, family income, geographic location, and age no longer impede the access of any citizen who can benefit from higher education.

28. By 1980, each segment of California public higher education shall approximate the general ethnic, sexual and economic composition of the state.

    a. Each segment shall prepare a plan for achieving this objective and report annually to the Postsecondary Education Commission on its progress. The Commission shall integrate and transmit the reports to the Legislature with comments and recommendations.

    b. This goal shall be achieved by provision of additional student spaces and not by the rejection of any qualified student.

    c. Institutions located in areas with concentrations of persons who have not had access

to higher education in the past shall have a special responsibility for achievement of this goal.

29. The following admissions criteria shall be adopted:

    a. The California Community Colleges shall continue to accept all applicants who are high school graduates and all adults who can benefit from the instruction offered.

    b. The California State University and Colleges shall select first time freshmen from among the 33 1/3% of high school graduates most capable of benefiting from the instruction offered.

    c. The University of California shall select first time freshmen from among the 12½% of high school graduates most capable of benefiting from the instruction offered.

    d. Both the California State University and Colleges and the University of California shall have the flexibility to utilize different criteria for admitting up to 12½% of their freshmen classes.

        1) to meet the objective specified in Recommendation #28

        2) to conduct controlled experiments designed to identify those students who are most capable of profiting from their instructional programs

    e. Each segment shall report annually to the Legislature through the Postsecondary Education Commission on the utilization of the 12½% flexibility.

    f. The criteria set forth in this recommendation shall not necessarily be applied to innovative programs designed to serve adults beyond the normal age of college attendance.

    g. The segments and/or institutions of higher

education may with the approval of the Postsecondary Education Commission alter the admissions criteria established in b, c, and d above. The conditions which might justify alteration include:

1) new knowledge based upon controlled experiments, carried out within the segments, which might provide a new basis for targeting students most likely to profit from instruction offered

2) capacities of segments and institutions

3) the needs of a geographic area

4) the programs of a specific institution.

h. Admissions criteria within the parameters specified in these recommendations need not be applied uniformly within each segment. The criteria are sufficiently flexible to allow for and encourage diversity of student mix within multicampus systems.

30. To facilitate the transfer of qualified students from two-year to four-year colleges and universities:

a. The University of California and California State University and Colleges shall continue to maintain a ceiling of 40% lower division students (we intend this to be a ceiling, not a floor; a campus may fall below 40% or even eliminate the lower division if circumstances justify).

b. Transfer students who were eligible for admission as freshmen to a four-year segment and who have maintained satisfactory academic standing shall continue to be eligible for admission at any undergraduate level to that segment.

c. Each campus within the four-year segments of public higher education shall implement measures to insure that upper division transfer students receive parity in admissions and course enrollments with previously

enrolled students.

d. The Postsecondary Education Commission shall assume full responsibility for coordinating transfer procedures among the public segments of California higher education.

31. The University of California and the California State University and Colleges shall develop a common undergraduate applications system similar to that used by each segment internally.

a. There shall be a single application form and fee for all four-year public institutions.

b. The applicant shall designate the institutions of his choice amongst the campuses in both segments.

32. Fee structures, admissions policies, and financial aids policies and programs shall eliminate discrimination against part-time students and students choosing to combine education with other experiences such as work or travel, by "stopping in" and "stopping out".

33. The state shall establish on an experimental basis (piloted for five years) independent postsecondary education counseling centers in several urban areas.

a. These centers shall offer college opportunity information and counseling to any potential applicant.

b. Counseling shall include information on proprietary schools and vocational education opportunities, as well as higher education.

c. The centers shall provide continually updated information for high school counselors responsible for college counseling.

d. They shall coordinate recruiting and counseling pools among neighboring institutions to facilitate admission of educationally

disadvantaged candidates.

e. The Postsecondary Education Commission shall be responsible for administering, staffing and evaluating these programs.

f. Staff shall be employees of the Postsecondary Education Commission.

34. Insofar as the four-year segments use high school achievement as the criterion for freshman admissions:

a. the high school records used shall normally begin with the 10th year

b. methods shall be devised to assess competencies rather than requiring specific high-school courses

c. when specific courses are required, no student attending high school on a full-time basis shall be required to devote more than two-thirds of his program to fulfilling course requirements.

35. It shall be the policy of the state that a community college be located within reasonable commuting distance of any concentration of potential students.

36. The Legislature shall assume responsibility for the undergraduate admissions policies of the public segments of California higher education, and shall empower the Postsecondary Education Commission to approve changes in segmental or institutional admissions policies.

CHAPTER VI

COOPERATION BETWEEN INSTITUTIONS

The preceding chapters and recommendations specified steps California must take to develop coordinated systems of postsecondary education capable of offering comprehensive educational services. Coordination and planning at the state and system office levels are critical. However, these efforts will be insufficient unless similar steps are taken at the institutional and regional levels.

The two four-year segments have statewide missions and in some instances serve a statewide clientele. But this does not preclude local responsibility. The location of a college or university has a significant impact upon the surrounding geographic community. Institutions of higher education have a responsibility to be aware of the educational needs of their local communities and to be responsive to those needs.

The potential for enhancing educational and economic effectiveness through cooperation within segments, and between institutions in different segments, has not been aggressively explored in California. The little cooperation which does occur is predominantly intra-segmental. There are some indications of renewed

interest in interinstitutional cooperation on the part of some California colleges and universities. Yet there is still an overriding emphasis upon institutional interests and objectives, rather than upon the interests of the students, communities, and regions which the institutions are expected to serve.

The traditional concept of a campus as an academically self-sufficient unit able or striving to meet all the needs of its students and faculty seems little disturbed by the changes that have occurred in the surrounding social environment.

A study team commissioned by the Joint Committee found few examples of cooperation between the state's three systems of public higher education or between public and private institutions. The segmental structure in California has often encouraged intrasegmental cooperation at the cost of creating greater obstacles to cooperation across segmental lines. The San Francisco Consortium is the only multipurpose cooperative arrangement involving institutions from each of the three public systems.

The study team concluded that the failure to form cooperative alliances across segmental lines is due to lack of interest within, and lack of inducements from without.

It also found--

- More cooperation is necessary because non-traditional forms of education require new organizational forms and because there is not going to be enough money to enable each institution to do everything it wants to do on its own.

- The smaller private colleges and the community colleges appear to be more sensitive to the need for cooperation.

- Cooperation within segments is important. It does not obviate the need for cooperation among different kinds of institutions. Each institution should be able to pursue its own strengths without the necessity of duplicating programs and services that may be better performed by another institution.

- There are only two examples of systematic faculty exchange agreements involving more than a few individuals. These arrangements are between institutions in the private sector.

- Student exchange arrangements or formal agreements for cross-registration or concurrent enrollment are much more common than faculty sharing. This does not mean, however, that large numbers of students are permitted to enroll at a second institution. The evidence is that most exchange agreements involve only a relatively few students.

- Formal student exchange agreements occur most frequently at the community college level. Several private institutions have small exchange programs in areas in which at least one of the participants has a very strong program. Among the larger colleges and universities, there seems to be a common belief that their students have no needs which these campuses cannot satisfy themselves.

- There appears to be very little cooperative use of plant and equipment among California's public and private institutions of higher education.

If planning is to be truly comprehensive, it must have a regional component. For each region of the state there should be a determination of the total demand for postsecondary education and of the availability of resources to meet that demand. Beyond planning, procedures should be developed in each region and across the state for sharing of facilities and faculty and for cross-registration of students. As educators and lay citizens come together to plan and cooperate, other avenues for interinstitutional cooperation will become apparent for California.

Interinstitutional cooperation recognizes and builds on institutional diversity. Different institutions do different things well; few institutions are able to offer an exhaustive range of educational services. Through interinstitutional cooperation the student in one institution can have access to the resources of other institutions and segments.

Exploration and development of interinstitutional cooperation will require commitment on the part of the state, the Postsecondary Education Commission and the higher education community. The establishment of regional councils is an essential first step. Each council

should include community representatives as well as representatives of each institution within the region. The initial effort of these councils should be in the area of comprehensive planning.

If such councils are created and receive strong support from the Legislature, Governor, Postsecondary Education Commission, and public and private educational institutions, California can increase its capacity to offer and enhance postsecondary education.

Some persons fear that the efforts to accelerate development of cooperative activities would jeopardize current voluntary efforts of a less ambitious nature within each segment. But the two are not mutually exclusive. Opportunities for interinstitutional cooperation will be severely limited as long as the initiative must come from the segments rather than from the individual campuses and the proposed regional councils.

RECOMMENDATIONS

37. The Postsecondary Education Commission shall prepare and transmit to the Legislature a plan for establishing regional councils throughout the state; each council shall be composed of community representatives and representatives of each institution within the region.

38. The regional councils shall promote interinstitutional cooperation and comprehensive regional planning. Specific functions shall include:

a. determining total demand, present and projected, for postsecondary education in each region

b. determining availability of public and private resources to meet demands for postsecondary education

c. finding methods for effectively utilizing or increasing educational resources

d. developing policies and procedures for the cross-registration of students and sharing of faculty and facilities

39. Regional planning shall have high priority in the use of federal grants for comprehensive statewide planning.

CHAPTER VII

NEW DIRECTIONS

The basic delivery system of higher education was developed in the late 19th and early 20th centuries and has remained basically unchanged since. This system assumes that a college or university is a physical location where students and teachers assemble, and that a college education consists of four years of courses. This assumption of space and time has, as one writer puts it, "obscured a vision of the future that may not only be more plausible, but also more desirable".[1]

Technological changes, the necessity for providing postsecondary education to persons who cannot come to the campus as full-time students, and a new skepticism about the use of credit hours and degrees as indicators of learning are forcing a reevaluation of campus-oriented traditional higher education.

Until recently, expanding access to higher education meant allowing greater numbers of persons in the 18 to 24-year-old age group to attend a college or university. In the future, postsecondary education will be less campus-bound and will serve persons in all age groups. Many individuals have neither the time nor resources to attend a conventional college or university. Yet their

needs for postsecondary education are often at least as great as the needs of those who attend conventional colleges and universities.

Some potential students, who might be served by alternative delivery systems and off-campus learning include:

- those who cannot afford the time or cost of conventional higher education
- those whose ethnic background has constrained them from full participation in the educational establishment
- those whose secondary preparation has been inadequate
- those with interests and talents not served by traditional education
- those whose educational progress has been interrupted by illness, military service or other temporary conditions
- those who have failed to take advantage of educational opportunity and come to regret it
- those who have become technologically unemployed and must retool themselves in mid-career
- those who are elderly and found no educational opportunities present at an earlier age
- those who are in prisons or hospitals or confined by illness in their homes
- those who are increasingly bored with the routine of a highly technological society or faced with increased leisure time
- those who must move frequently in order to accompany spouses or pursue careers.

The results of a recent national survey of adult

learning needs (see Table #VI) revealed a great unmet demand for adult education but little enthusiasm for attending traditional colleges and universities. Caution is advisable in applying results of a national study to a single state. But limited market surveys undertaken by the University of California and the California State University and Colleges, and a recent study of educational needs in northeastern California, tend to confirm existence in California of a large unmet need for postsecondary education. We are concerned about meeting that need.

Certification

There are many ways of acquiring knowledge and competencies besides attending college. It is wasteful of time and resources of individuals and the state to insist that persons who have acquired knowledge outside the classroom return to college to accumulate academic credit hours for a degree. In addition, some persons are highly mobile and never have the opportunity to remain in one institution long enough to fulfill residency requirements for degrees. There should be an agency which can evaluate their extramural learning, including work experience, and award a degree when the requisite knowledge

Table VI

WHAT ADULTS WOULD LIKE TO STUDY

	Total Choices	First Choice
Vocational subjects (architecture, business skills, commercial art, computer science, cosmetology, education and teacher training, engineering, industrial trades, journalism, law, management skills, medicine and dentistry, nursing, salesmanship, technical skills)	78.2%	43.0%
Hobbies and recreation (crafts, fine and visual arts, flight training, performing arts, safety, sports and games, travel and living in foreign countries)	62.8%	13.4%
Home and family life (child development, gardening and flower arranging, home repairs, sewing and cooking)	56.0%	12.0%
Personal development (investment, occult sciences, personal psychology, physical fitness and self-development, public speaking)	54.3%	6.8%
General education (basic education, biological sciences, creative writing, English-language training, great books, humanities, languages, physical sciences, social sciences)	47.9%	12.6%
Public affairs (citizenship, community problems and organizations, consumer education, environmental studies, public affairs)	36.3%	4.5%
Religious studies	15.4%	3.0%
Agriculture and farming	10.9%	2.9%

WHERE ADULTS CHOOSE TO STUDY

	Would-be Learners	Learners
Public high school (day or evening)	15.8%	9.1%
Community-run "free school"	10.4%	2.6%
Public two-year college or technical school	9.8%	5.9%
Home	9.6%	16.9%
Four-year college or university	8.5%	5.5%
Private trade or business school	7.6%	2.9%
Business or industrial site	4.9%	5.3%
Individual instructor	4.7%	4.4%
Employer	4.6%	13.1%
Correspondence school	3.6%	2.4%
Community or social organization	3.2%	6.1%
Fine arts, performing arts, or crafts studio	2.8%	0.2%
Graduate school	2.6%	2.4%
Religious institution or group	1.9%	6.3%
Government agency (federal, state, local)	1.6%	5.5%
Recreational or sports group	1.2%	2.1%
Library or other cultural institution	1.1%	2.2%
Other site	1.3%	1.6%

MAIN OBSTACLES TO ADULTS' LEARNING

Cost, including tuition and all incidentals	53.0%
Not enough time	46.2%
Don't want to go to school full-time	35.1%
Home responsibilities	32.1%
Job responsibilities	28.4%
Amount of time required to complete program	20.8%
Afraid that I'm too old to begin	17.2%
No information about where I can get what I want	16.5%
Courses I want aren't scheduled when I can attend	15.7%
Strict attendance requirements	14.9%

NOTE: Would-be learners are individuals who would like to study in the coming year; learners are those who have studied within the past year. Data compiled in summer of 1972.

SOURCE: COMMISSION ON NON-TRADITIONAL STUDY

is attained.

Conventional colleges and universities nearly monopolize the certification and credentialing functions in our society. We believe these functions have been overemphasized by society and institutions of higher education. There should be alternative means of attaining credentials, certificates and degrees for persons who acquire the necessary competencies but are unable or unwilling to participate in conventional postsecondary education. The availability of alternative routes to certification would allow qualified persons to advance educationally, occupationally and professionally. It would release "captive audiences" (those whose only interest is in acquiring a passport to employment) from colleges and universities. And it would free institutions of education from domination by credentialing functions to concentrate on learning. Learning, not credentialing, is the primary purpose of higher education.

Off-Campus Learning

In the foreseeable future, conventional campuses will continue to play a most important role in providing higher education. However, they must be complemented by new approaches.

We are particularly concerned with the development of off-campus programs which attempt to bring postsecondary education to the student. If properly developed, these can enhance access and choice for the people of California.

Some of the characteristics of these extended forms of higher education include new student clientele, new instructional techniques, new uses of media, off-campus settings, credit by examination, and credit for work and other non-academic experiences. Many of these techniques have been in existence for a long time but their magnitude and importance is increasing. Several approaches utilize outcomes evaluation of learning, shifting the emphasis from hours spent in a classroom and study to educational achievements.

At the present time in California many public and private colleges and universities are developing programs for delivering education to the learner wherever he or she may be. In the public sector, several community colleges have long offered off-campus educational services to persons unable to attend college for reasons of age, geographical location, or other commitments. The California State University and Colleges have recently established a Commission on External Degrees. The University of California is developing its Extended University.

Several major policy issues are raised by these conditions and developments. Should California commit itself to off-campus learning? If so, how should programs be developed? Should each segment establish and pursue an independent course of action? Would an integrated state approach be more effective?

A New Segment

We believe California should commit itself to extended learning where there is a need and clientele for this type of educational service. We have concluded that a statewide integrated effort is likely to be more effective than a fragmented effort with each segment defining its own goals and interests. We propose that a fourth public segment, the California Cooperative University, be established in California. It should have the primary responsibility for planning and coordinating off-campus programs and should be authorized to offer its own programs and award credits and degrees.

The first mission of the new segment would be to develop and submit a state plan for off-campus postsecondary education to the Postsecondary Education Commission and to the Legislature. The Cooperative University is to coordinate the efforts of the segments in

extended learning and to provide programs under its own auspices when there are needs the segments are not meeting. It is to work with the regional councils (proposed in Chapter VI) in assessing need for off-campus postsecondary education and resources available to meet the needs.

The Cooperative University should also develop methods of recognizing achievement on the basis of experiential learning and equivalency tests. One function should be to establish and maintain a "credit bank". Those persons who accumulate credits from several sources (conventional academic work, work experience, and tests) can have records of their achievement evaluated and maintained, and can be awarded degrees when appropriate. Finally, the new segment, in conjunction with the existing segments, is to develop and implement alternative delivery systems. These should include individualized and independent study through television and computer-based instruction.

The concept of a fourth segment will not be popular with many leaders in the California higher education community. Many of these persons sincerely believe that any new educational programs should be developed exclusively through existing institutions. Some see themselves as the guardians of academic standards and fear an erosion if some aspects of higher education are outside

their jurisdiction. Others fear that competition from another segment will have an adverse impact upon their institutions. Still others envision external programs as a method of maintaining institutional growth at a time when the normal college age population is increasing very slowly.

We have carefully considered each of these positions. There are dangers in any new undertaking, but there are greater risks in failing to take the initiatives dictated by societal and educational needs.

Several considerations prompt our decision to create a fourth public segment.

First, we find ourselves lagging behind other states in moving towards making off-campus educational services available to our citizens.

Next, the expertise of the staffs, and, particularly of the faculties of the University of California and the California State University and Colleges, is in the area of conventional classroom education. In an extensive survey, we found little interest on the part of faculties in external programs. Yet, as we have watched the development of external programs within the segments, we have seen the faculties establish virtual control over the programs. We agree that high standards should be maintained and protected, but there is an unhealthy

tendency on the part of the faculties to equate high standards with conventional approaches. We believe faculty as individuals should be encouraged to participate in external programs of their own institutions and of the fourth segment. However, we do not believe the collective faculty should have an effective veto over the development of these programs. We see little possibility for curricular innovation and new approaches to learning keyed to new clientele as long as courses and programs must be channeled through conventional departments and academic senates. There should be quality controls for all extended learning programs. However, quality does not mean giving the most power to those with the least commitment to the programs.

Third, it seems likely that external programs, if left fragmented, will be more responsive to institutional interests than to the education needs of the people of California. We have observed little evidence of joint planning or cooperation on the part of those responsible for the University of California and California State University and Colleges programs. Though there is some sharing of data, coordination is almost nonexistent. Coordination should begin while the programs are in their early development, not after their directions are largely determined. Development of

autonomous external programs will only add to problems of coordination and planning.

Finally, the segmental organization of California higher education seems inappropriate to many of the new approaches. Such constraints, as the separation of lower and upper division, are not likely to facilitate nontraditional learning.

The Postsecondary Education Commission should develop and submit to the Legislature a plan for establishment of the California Cooperative University. The plan should include provisions for an autonomous governing board independent of the other segments, a small administrative staff and faculty, but no campuses. The new segment is not to be governed or administered by the Postsecondary Education Commission or any state agency. It is to be fully accredited.

"The College of California"

A report prepared for the Joint Committee recommended that California establish a new educational institution designed and staffed by nonacademic professional leaders for comprehensive adult education.* The

---

*Alternative Forms of Higher Education for California

concept of involving practitioners of various professions in the educational process has merit. The Post-secondary Education Commission should undertake a feasibility study to determine the need and value for this type of education. If it is determined that the proposal for a "College of California" should be implemented, the concept should be incorporated into the Cooperative University.

Institutionalizing Innovation

Second only to the need to institutionalize diversity is the need to institutionalize innovation. Through carefully controlled experimentation we can discover more about the learning process, about how to serve new and diverse clientele and how to improve cost effectiveness and productivity. The development of this new knowledge is essential to the continuing vitality of California higher education. It will require commitment of resources, imagination and energy on the part of the state and our institutions of higher education.

We endorse the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education's recent recommendation that each college and university annually reallocate 1 to 3 percent of existing resources for new endeavors.

Commitment to self-renewal should exist at every level - state, segmental institutional, departmental, etc. The state should establish a continuing fund for the support of innovations in postsecondary education. The fund should be administered by the Postsecondary Education Commission with the assistance of an advisory committee to review proposals.

The State Postsecondary Education Commission should develop and submit to the Legislature a plan for administering the innovation fund. The plan should include the following provisions:

- Funds should be awarded on a contractual basis upon acceptance of proposals.
- Individuals or institutions in public or private non-profit postsecondary education should be eligible to apply. A healthy competition for experimentation funds is desirable.
- No project should be supported for more than three years. After evaluation, successful projects should be integrated into institutional and segmental budgets; others should be dropped.
- At least ten percent of each grant is to be used for evaluation and dissemination of results. An advantage of a state-sponsored innovation fund is that results can more easily be made available to all institutions of higher education in California.

RECOMMENDATIONS

40. The state shall establish a fourth segment of California public postsecondary education.

a. Responsibilities shall include:

(1) developing and submitting to the Postsecondary Education Commission and the Legislature a state plan for extended forms of higher education. The purpose of such a plan is to: coordinate the segmental efforts, statewide and regionally; provide for development of new programs when there are needs unmet by the other statewide segments; and establish policies and procedures in such areas as funding, admissions, and financial aids

(2) awarding credits on the basis of experiential learning and equivalency tests

(3) maintaining a credit bank for persons who accumulate academic credit through several channels: postsecondary institutions, work experience, tests

(4) awarding degrees

(5) developing and implementing alternative delivery systems including individualized and independent study

b. This segment shall consist of a minimum of administrative staff and faculty but shall have no campuses.

c. The Postsecondary Education Commission shall develop a plan for implementation of this proposal, including governance mechanisms for the new segment.

41. The Postsecondary Education Commission shall study the proposal for an institution operated by non-academic professionals and report to the Legislature on the need, feasibility and costs.

42. Each public institution of higher education in the state should redeploy 1 - 3% of its annual operating budget for the purposes of supporting innovative programs.

43. The Legislature shall establish a fund to support innovation in postsecondary education.

    a. The fund shall be supported at the level of 3% of the annual state operating budget for postsecondary education.

    b. It shall be utilized to support: innovative proposals for providing educational services to new clientele; new curriculum and pedagogy; greater cost effectiveness and productivity.

    c. Individuals or institutions in non-profit postsecondary education shall be eligible for grants.

    d. A minimum of 10% of each grant shall be used for evaluation and dissemination of results.

    e. No project shall be supported by this fund for more than three years.

    f. The Postsecondary Education Committee shall develop and submit to the Legislature a plan for administering the innovation fund.

CHAPTER VIII

INDEPENDENT HIGHER EDUCATION

Independent or private non-profit institutions provide significant higher education to Californians - both quantitatively and qualitatively. They constitute a major resource and play an integral part in California's total higher education effort.

These institutions number approximately seventy, about fifty of which collectively form the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities (AICCU). In 1971-72, AICCU institutions enrolled more than 118,000 full- and part-time students (a larger number than attends the University of California), the equivalent of over 98,000 full-time students. They granted more than 24,000 degrees in 1970-71.[1] Generally they are characterized by the following:

- independence of control and governing authority
- more diverse sources of financial support
- lack of governmental bureaucracy
- freedom to innovate and to meet students' needs
- diversity of missions, size, functions, and educational programs
- freedom to be more directly concerned about personal, ethical and moral values.
- high student charges

The value of these institutions lies both in their response to the educational needs and wants of many Californians, and in the diversity they add to California's total system of higher education. They offer unique opportunities for innovation and experimentation in higher education. Also, they divert large numbers of students who would theoretically otherwise enroll in public institutions at a direct cost to taxpayers.

At this point in time, California's independent colleges and universities are increasingly concerned about their own survival and viability - a concern shared by the Joint Committee. The growth rate of student enrollments has slowed and is projected to level in the 1980's. This combines with economic factors to pose a serious concern about the future of these institutions.

For whatever reasons (and recognizing a national trend in the same direction), California's independent institutions experienced an 8.5 percent decline in freshman applications and a 5.2 percent decline in transfer applications from April of 1971 to April of 1972. Twelve institutions experienced a decrease in the number of full-time undergraduate students during that period.[2]

The major reason is probably the dramatically widened

"tuition gap" - the difference between what it costs a student to attend an independent institution and what it costs him to attend a public institution. California maintains a mixed no- and low-tuition policy while inflation and other rising costs have greatly increased tuition at the independent institutions. So the tuition gap has widened by $1332 during the last 16 years. In 1956, it was $546. In 1972, it was $1878. In the Fall of 1973, it is likely to be $2000.[3]

In addition to the widening tuition gap and the decline in applications, many of the private colleges have suffered budgetary crises in recent years. In 1968-69, these institutions had a combined surplus of $2.5 million. In 1970-71, there was a combined deficit of $6 million, although the number of institutions with operating deficits had decreased from 26 to 23.[4]

So the policy question is whether or not California has a responsibility to assure the survival, quality and vitality of these institutions. And, if the answer is yes, how does the state do so without interfering with institutional independence and autonomy? If, in fact, state financial assistance is necessary for their very survival, the matter of assuring quality becomes critical. The state government has a responsibility

to assure that taxpayers' money is spent for quality education. We do not imply, however, that the quality of independent institutions is generally questioned.

California's constitution specifically prohibits the appropriation of public money for the support of any sectarian or denominational school, or any school not under the exclusive control of the officers of the public schools. While the Constitution Revision Commission in 1970 recommended a change to allow direct assistance to nonsectarian private institutions, there has been little progress towards legislative implementation.

The conflicting values of state responsibility and institutional autonomy are probably best reconciled with the continuation and expansion of current programs which channel funds through students rather than directly to institutions. The Joint Committee has concluded that this approach has educational and economic merit. Channeling aid through the consumer also increases student options.

California operates a state scholarship program which permits recipients to use their award at any accredited public or private institution of higher education in the state. In 1971-72, nearly 47 percent

of the scholarships, representing almost 80 percent of state scholarship dollars, were used at independent colleges and universities. According to the 1973-74 Governor's Budget, the average cost of a state scholarship for a student at an independent college is less than the average cost to the state (including capital outlay) of educating a scholarship student at the University of California.[5]

The Legislature has authorized state scholarships for 3.5 percent of high school graduates. Expansion of this and other programs, as proposed in Chapter IX, would maximize student choice and further aid higher education's independent sector.

If the levels of student aid we have proposed do not meet the financial problems of the independent institutions, then the Legislature and the Postsecondary Education Commission should explore and evaluate the emerging tuition-equalization proposals. Again, aid should be provided to students, not directly to institutions.

Since independent colleges and universities are such a vital element in California's educational capability, it is important that there be cooperation between independent and public institutions at state and regional levels. The Postsecondary Education Commission

and the regional councils proposed in Chapter VI should include representation of these institutions and consideration of their needs, though in such a manner as not to jeopardize their independence and autonomy.

As a practical and economic matter the state should periodically determine whether private institutions are being fully utilized and, if not, what state policies could encourage greater use of capacities and resources. Accordingly, the Postsecondary Education Commission should keep the Governor and Legislature advised about the welfare of independent higher education.

RECOMMENDATIONS

44. California's independent colleges and universities shall have representation on the Postsecondary Education Commission*

45. The Legislature shall urge California's independent institutions to participate (voluntarily) in the state programs for interinstitutional cooperation and regional consortia.

46. The Legislature shall expand existing student financial assistance programs which allow the student to utilize his aid at independent institutions.**

47. Any additional financial aid to independent institutions shall be channeled through the student.

* See Recommendation # 20
** See Recommendation # 50

48. The Postsecondary Education Commission shall annually report, with recommendations, to the Legislature and Governor regarding the financial conditions of independent institutions, their enrollment and application figures, the number of student spaces available, and and the respective cost of utilizing those spaces versus providing additional public spaces.

CHAPTER IX

FINANCING

The major issues of financing California post-secondary education include:

- maintaining a level of support to assure high quality and equal access
- developing budgeting and funding policies to enhance flexibility, diversity, and responsiveness to changing needs for educational services
- pricing higher education in a manner which will optimize access
- meeting the needs for student financial assistance
- economizing and increasing productivity in a manner consistent with educational quality
- insuring the survival of independent higher education.

California currently spends more on higher education than any other state. In 1971-72, state support was about $882 million with local sources adding another $332 million. The state's share represented 12.8% of general fund revenues. In 1970-71, the latest year for which figures are available, California ranked nineteenth among the states in combined state and local appropriations for higher education per full-time equivalent student, and ninth in combined state and local appropriations for higher education per $1000 of per capital personal income.

Over the past decade California has gradually increased the portion of public revenues devoted to post-secondary education though not at the rate of inflation and enrollment increases (see Table VII). This has contributed to a "cost-revenue squeeze" characterized by increased expenditures for personal services and equipment exceeding the general rate of inflation without a corresponding increase in available revenues. The situation was accentuated by the difficulties of off-setting higher costs with greater productivity, competing social and political priorities, public disenchantment, economic recession, and statutory formulas for other state programs which left higher education with whatever remained in the general fund.

We do not believe higher education should be used as the "balancing" factor in state budgets. The improved outlook for the economy and state revenues makes this unlikely in the future. Additionally, public confidence may be slowly restored and serious attempts at greater productivity may bring economies. However, the days of money on demand are past. The efficient allocation and utilization of limited resources will be a continuing problem for higher education in the years ahead.

Table VII

STATE BUDGET EXPENDITURES FOR HIGHER EDUCATION*
(Millions of dollars)

	Total State Budget Expenditures	Expended for U of Calif.		Expended for State U & C		Expended for C.C.'s		Total Public Segment (1)	
		Amount	% of Total	Amount	% of Total	Amount	% of Total	Amount	% of Total
1966-67	4,145	243	5.9%	168	4.1%	71	1.7% (5.4%)	482 (643)	11.6%
1967-68	4,670	247	5.3%	197	4.2%	82	1.8% (5.2%)	526 (694)	11.3%
1968-69	5,267	291	5.5%	237	4.5%	105	2.0% (5.8%)	633 (847)	12.0%
1969-70	6,073	330	5.4%	288	4.7%	127	2.1% (6.0%)	745 (995)	12.3%
1970-71	6,213	337	5.4%	305	4.9%	163	2.6% (6.9%)	805 (1093)	13.0%
1971-72	6,471	337	5.2%	305	4.7%	184	2.8% (7.7%)	826 (1168)	12.8%
1972-73 (request)	7,240	336	4.6%	350	4.8%	222	3.1% (7.7%)	908 (1274)	12.5%

(1) Institutional total only. Excludes state scholarships, etc.

*Data from budget reports of the Legislative Analyst.

Uncertainties

At no time in the recent history of postsecondary education have so many uncertainties surrounded the issues of financing. Major questions beyond the purview of the Legislature will ultimately be decided by the courts and the federal government, including:

- What is the legality of charging non-resident tuition to persons who have declared residency in California?

- Will family income remain the basis for determining student financial aid to recently emancipated eighteen-year-olds?

- Will the Serrano and related decisions requiring equalization of public funding be held applicable to community colleges?

- Will the federal government fund Basic Opportunity Grants to provide a grant up to $1400 to any student attending postsecondary education?*

- What will be the conclusions and impact of the National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education established by Congress in the Education Amendments of 1972?

With so many significant uncertainties, we have decided to propose no fundamental alterations in pricing or budgeting at this time.

We did, however, examine various policy options.* We were impressed with the concept of "portability" - in effect, funding students directly and letting them

---

*Implications are analyzed in our consultant report Financing Postsecondary Education in California.

take their educational subsidy to the institution of their choice. This approach was adopted by Congress in the Education Amendments of 1972. A system of portable grants suggests a revised pricing policy. Together these approaches to pricing and budgeting deserve serious evaluation by California when some of the major questions surrounding higher education finance are clarified.

Tuition

We propose that the Legislature assume jurisdiction over all student charges in public postsecondary education. Authority to level fees should reside in one agency. When a segment can charge fees independently without regard to the impact on other segments and state student financial aid programs, the prospects for rational state planning and coordination are considerably diminished. The levels of student charges are matters of public policy and forms of taxation. Hence, powers to levy tuition and fees should reside with elected representatives of the people.

When student charges are levied, they should not be utilized for financing the construction of physical facilities for instructional purposes. The state should

provide the necessary instructional physical facilities for the University of California and the California State University and Colleges.

Funds for construction of instructional facilities should be obtained by legislative appropriation, state bonding approved by the voters, or private donation. Students should not be taxed to pay for such facilities in lieu of funding by the people or their elected representatives.

Student Aid

The Master Plan Survey Team did not give adequate attention to financial assistance. As a result, most of the current programs were developed on an ad hoc and piecemeal basis during the 1960's. We believe it is time to rationalize these programs and their interrelationships.

Two basic and complementary approaches are currently embodied in California's programs of financial aid. The first is providing aid to economically disadvantaged students of demonstrated high potential. This is the objective of state scholarships and college opportunity grants. The second approach provides aid to students who are both economically and educationally

disadvantaged and have potential to benefit from higher education. Most educational opportunity programs serve this purpose. Both types of student aid have merit and both have been remarkably successful in making higher education possible for many students.

The recent Student Resources Survey conducted by the State Scholarship and Loan Commission revealed a significant gap between available student financial aid and legitimate need for assistance. This study concluded that, "In all segments students with financial need were denied aid because the institution had insufficient funds to assist them."[1] Because only persons already participating in higher education were surveyed we do not know how many may be completely excluded for economic reasons. In addition, we know that California ranks among the lowest of the large states in providing student assistance. There is clearly a need for more aid.

California's existing framework of financial aid programs can meet student assistance needs. However, each aid program must be expanded, the allocations must be put on a rational and consistent basis, and administration must be improved to insure that assistance goes to the students whose needs are greatest.

California State Scholarships are awarded to

academically able students who need financial assistance to meet their tuition and fee costs. They may be used in any accredited institution of higher education. The maximum grant is $2250. The number of new state scholarships should be increased from the annual 3.5 percent of high school graduates to 5 percent. This increase should be phased in with an increase of .5 percent annually until 5 percent is reached. In addition to assisting more needy students of high achievement, raising the number of state scholarship awards will help insure the survival of independent higher education.

The College Opportunity Grant Program (COG) assists students from low-income families, largely from minority groups, whose high school records demonstrate high potential for additional education. Grants may be used for subsistence as well as direct costs of education. This program has been highly successful and should also be expanded. Presently, it has no established allocation rationale. We recommend that a base be provided at an annual rate of 1 percent of high school graduates. This would increase new grants by 50% over the current base of 2000 per year.

Educational opportunity programs (EOP) have succeeded in allowing many students of low income and poor

quality pre-college education, but with potential and motivation, to participate in California higher education. These programs also lack a rational allocation base and are more subject to the vicissitudes of the annual budget than state scholarships or college opportunity grants. In addition, there is need to insure that these programs are administered flexibly and that they go to the most needy students each year.

We propose that EOP be funded at the rate of 5 percent of the University of California and California State University and Colleges full-time equivalent student enrollment, and 5% of the average daily attendance of the California Community Colleges, excluding adult education. The funding level should average $500 per award. The funds should be appropriated to the State Scholarship and Loan Commission for allocation. Each public college and university would then be allocated EOP funds upon the Scholarship and Loan Commission's determination of greatest need. However, no institution's program should be funded at a rate less than 2 percent of full-time students.

This approach to EOP would provide rationality and stability, and would allow for improved planning and administration. It would improve the capacity of the state to identify the greatest needs and channel funds

to meet them.

The Occupational Educational Training Grant Program enables talented and financially needy students to commence and finish a postsecondary vocational program. This program has merit based upon its objectives. Like EOP and COG it has no specified allocation base. Five hundred awards at an average level of $1000 are authorized for the initial year. We believe the program should be funded on a basis of .5 percent of high school graduates annually. This would increase the number of yearly grants to 1500.

The Graduate Fellowship Program assists students in professional or graduate studies. Its purpose is to permit able and financially needy students to pursue advanced work. Like state scholarships and the COGs, Graduate Fellowships can be used at any accredited institution of higher education. Thus, they assist California's independent colleges by increasing the number of students able to attend. Although this program is authorized to be funded as high as 2 percent of the AB degrees granted in California in the previous academic year, it has never been fully funded. We propose full funding. We also believe recipients of graduate fellowships should be limited to four renewals. There is presently no limit on renewals.

TABLE VIII

ESTIMATED IMPACT OF FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PROPOSALS

	Funding at Level of 1973-74 Governor's Budget		Joint Committee Proposal 1973-74		Joint Committee Proposal 1976-77[1]	
	Students	Funds[2]	Students	Funds[2]	Students	Funds[2]
State Scholarship	27,819	28.1	27,819	28.1	40,000	40.0 [3]
COG	4,825	6.4	6,033	7.6	10,000	12.7 [3]
EOP	25,000	7.4	40,879	20.4	45,000	27.5 [4]
Graduate Fellowship	600	1.1	1,500	2.5	1,700	2.7
Occupational Education	500	.5	1,599	1.6	1,625	1.6 [3]
	59,344	43.5	77,830	60.2	98,325	79.5 [5]

1 Assumes 1973-74 constant dollar value
2 In millions of dollars
3 Assumes 325,000 high school graduates
4 Assumes full-time enrollment of 900,000
5 Comparable extrapolation of current Governor's Budget spending levels is not available

Finally, the law should specify the state's commitment to each of the programs and its intent to fund them jointly. This will assure California of a comprehensive approach to student financial aids and guarantee the availability of both legitimate types of financial assistance - aid to those of demonstrated high potential who are economically needy and aid to those who are educationally and economically disadvantaged.

Productivity and Efficiency

Despite numerous societal, technological and educational changes over the past four decades, higher education has only slightly altered its basic design. In California, there has recently emerged on the part of some colleges and universities a new interest in experimenting to achieve increased productivity and efficiency while maintaining or improving educational quality. Many of the approaches being developed can break the academic "lock-step" while individializing education for students and freeing faculty time for advising and consulting with students.

RECOMMENDATIONS

49. The Legislature shall assume jurisdiction

over all student charges in the public segments.

50. Allocation bases shall be established as follows for state student financial aids programs:

    a. The State Scholarship Program shall be funded at a level of 5 percent of high school graduates. This program shall be increased at an annual rate of .5 percent until the 5 percent level is achieved.

    b. The College Opportunity Grants Program shall be funded at a level of 1 percent of high school graduates.

    c. The Educational Opportunity Program shall be funded at a level of 5 percent of full time equivalent enrollments, average daily attendance, excluding adult education, and an average of $500 per award.

    d. The Occupational Education Training Grant Program shall be funded at a level of .5 percent of high school graduates.

    e. The Graduate Fellowship Program shall be fully funded at the currently authorized level of 2 percent of AB degrees and recipients shall be limited to four renewals.

    f. The Legislature shall fund the above programs jointly. Funds shall be appropriated to the State Scholarship and Loan Commission. The Commission shall allocate the EOP money to campuses on the basis of need, except that no institution shall receive a level of support less than 2 percent of full-time students. The funding level shall average $500 per award. The Commission shall administer other programs as at present.

51. The following proposals for increasing educational productivity and cost effectiveness should be considered carefully by each institution of higher education:

a. acceleration of certificate and degree programs where consistent with educational quality

b. creating new graduate programs only under exceptional circumstances of student demand and societal need

c. greater use of advanced placement and challenge examinations

d. interinstitutional and intersegmental cooperation, including sharing of facilities, faculty and concurrent enrollment of students

e. continued review by the public segments of the feasibility of cooperative arrangements as a major criterion in the capital review process

f. greater use of technology, particularly tapes, television, and other media which are conducive to student self-paced learning and educational flexibility

g. development of methods to encourage cost effectiveness at all levels, but particularly among the faculty (There should be incentives such as additional funds for innovation from savings achieved. This will require the cooperation of faculty, administrators, and state government.)

h. improvement of management techniques and information systems, including the development of capacity to compare costs and results of comparable programs

i. development of an outcomes approach to budgeting for postsecondary education

j. utilization of all available academic and non-academic facilities on and off campus

k. continued efforts to maximize facility utilization including evenings and weekends

l. provision of adequate support services to faculty to insure that their time and energies are freed for teaching and/or research

m. improvement of the transfer processes to insure removal of unreasonable barriers, particularly between two-year and four-year institutions, and to avoid repetition of courses covering similar material

n. improved programatic articulation with high schools to avoid unnecessary repetition of subject matter

o. continuing review of the feasibility of year-round operation

p. early admission of advanced high school students

q. careful and vigorous monitoring of the growth of administrative staffs, particularly in the segmental central offices.

52. Besides the students who use the formal instructional services of public higher education, there are others who receive a wide range of services including such diverse activities as basic and applied research, studies, consultation, data accumulation and analyses, and entertainment. Systematic data on policies and practices in these public service areas are not now available, but it is possible that full cost is not being charged for all these services. Each public segment shall conduct careful analyses of such costs and adopt a full-cost pricing policy.

53. Except in unusual circumstances, the budgeting and auditing methods of state government should emphasize program budget review and approval and programatic accountability. Line-item budgeting and auditing creates inflexibility and hinders the development of accountability based upon educational outcomes.

54. System offices of the segments should not inflexibly apply the funding formula developed for the segments to subunits of individual campuses. Each segment should develop and implement administrative means for providing to each campus the broadest flexibility of operation consistent with responsible management.

55. Funds derived from tuition and other student charges shal. not be used for the financing of construction of physical facilities for instructional purposes.

56. The state shall make every effort to achieve parity in faculty compensation between the University of California and the California State University and Colleges.

AFTERWORD

The future of our state and society depends largely upon the quality of education available to our citizens.

In an age of automation, technology, affluence and mass media, increasing education has become a practical necessity. Education beyond the high school has already become a reality for most Californians. This will be no less true in coming years.

We live in a time of remarkable uncertainties. We find ourselves challenged by profound and perplexing questions of peace and war, race and sex, work and leisure, drugs and violence, exploration of space, ecological crises, liberation movements, and biological revolution.

Amidst it all, changes are eagerly sought by some and eagerly fought by others. Some people envision the future as an extrapolation of the past, others foresee radical departures. Some want our educational institutions to socialize and prepare people to maintain our present society's values and institutions; others want education to prepare persons to change society.

The differences extend even to the learning process itself. Some persons conceptualize education as training of the intellect; others propose to include the affective

domain. Some advocate traditional and disciplined structure; others suggest independent study and experiential learning.

As a committee we do not favor one or the other of these positions. We value the diversity of opinions and judgments held by individual Californians, indeed by members of this Committee. We do not believe that either life or education need be the same for everyone.

The major task for postsecondary education is to meet these divergent hopes and expectations of Californians.

II

During our study we have found several assumptions implicit in the way many persons view higher education. We have come to be skeptical about the continuing validity of these assumptions, and believe critical reevaluation is essential to the survival of California higher education.

We question whether

- The "good old days", usually referring to the early 1960's, will return shortly. We can already see that the conditions of the 1970's are markedly different.

- A change in political leadership of the legislative and/or executive branch of government will dramatically improve the financial condition of higher

education. Throughout the nation, governors and legislatures of both parties and all philosophies have found themselves constrained by fiscal conditions.

- Every campus can be self-sufficient and all-inclusive. It seems clear that enrollments and fiscal conditions will not permit the duplication involved in making every campus comprehensive.

- The quality of an institution depends upon the selectivity of its admissions standards rather than upon what happens to the student while he or she is in the institution. Highly selective campuses often have the least effect upon a student.

- Low or no tuition serves the poor. The vast majority of those who benefit are not poor.

- The scientific method is the only legitimate method of learning. Other types of experiential learning occur throughout our society. Who is to say which is more valuable or significant?

- Educational institutions are the best dispensers of knowledge in our society. Rapidly emerging technologies can deliver knowledge anywhere.

- Published research is a necessary condition of good teaching. No necessary correlation between teaching and research has been proven.

- A Ph.D. degree is an essential qualification for college and university teaching. The Ph.D. is primarily a research degree with little preparation for teaching involved in its acquisition.

We invite the academic community to apply its critical method and spirit to these assumptions.

III

We recognize the limitations of constitutional, sta-

tutory, or other structural change, especially when imposed from outside. We know that the value and relevance of education will not be legislated. No matter how we structure postsecondary education, it will finally be those persons within the institutions who will breathe life or death into higher education. For, in the last analysis, people -- not institutions -- determine the course of history and the course of education.

Especially for that reason, we have attempted from the very beginning to include educators and the public in our process. We have tried to generate a public discussion throughout California, and upon each campus, about the future of higher education. Initially we sent a copy of our study plan to each public and private campus chief executive. Later we sent the results of our goals survey. In each instance we suggested that the material serve as the basis for a local autonomous process of self-discovery and self-renewal.

We now invite each campus of postsecondary education in California to convene itself with all its constituent communities to generate a discussion about this draft report and our recommendations. We believe this will facilitate the self-examination and self-renewal essential for the healthy future of California higher education.

We also invite the people of California to participate in discussions of this report. We believe that will ensure the public involvement and confidence equally essential for the healthy future of California higher education.

We hope that together these discussions will bring us a wide range of response, to assure that we are fully informed as we deliberate and prepare our final conclusions and recommendations for submission to the Legislature in May.

APPENDIX A

SCHEDULE OF FORTHCOMING PUBLIC HEARINGS ON THE
DRAFT REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE
ON THE MASTER PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Friday, March 2	State Capitol Room 2117 Sacramento
Friday, March 9	University of California, Irvine 220 Social Science Bldg.
Friday, March 16	California State University San Jose Umunhum Room Student Union
Friday, March 23	El Camino College Torrance Campus Center 1
Friday, March 30	University of San Francisco Room 421 University Center Building

*All hearings start at 9:30 a.m.

APPENDIX B

PUBLIC HEARINGS OF THE
JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE MASTER PLAN
FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
1971-1973

Subject	Date
Education for the Future of Education	September 17, 1971
Report of the Ad Hoc Advisory Committee	October 6, 1971
Joint Committee Study Plan	January 17, 1972
Structure of Public Higher Education	February 9, 1972
Governance and Coordination of California Higher Education	February 16 and February 23, 1972
Independent Higher Education	March 1, 1972
Alternative Forms of Higher Education	March 8 and March 22, 1972
Planning for Postsecondary Education	April 5, 1972
Financing Postsecondary Education	April 12 and April 19, 1972
Access to Higher Education	April 26 and May 3, 1972
Regional Articulation and Co-operation among Institutions of Higher Education (Subcommittee)- San Bernardino	May 22, 1972
Regional Articulation and Co-operation among Institutions of Higher Education (Subcommittee) - San Diego	September 11, 1972
Select Committee Report	January 3, 1973

APPENDIX C

JOINT COMMITTEE DOCUMENTS AND PAPERS

Title	Author
California Postsecondary Education: Questions and Issues, Staff Report #1	JCMPHE Staff
A Summary of Major Proposals Considered by the Master Plan Survey Team in 1960	JCMPHE Staff
Financing Postsecondary Education in California	Academy for Educational Development
Evaluating Higher Education in California	Michael Scriven
Graduate Education in California	Lewis Mayhew
The Role of Research in California Higher Education	Lewis Mayhew
Chicanos and Public Higher Education in California	Ronald W. Lopez and Darryl D. Enos
Independent Higher Education in California	Fred A. Nelson
Alternative Forms of Higher Education for California	Warren Bryan Martin
Interinstitutional Cooperation in California Higher Education	Academy for Educational Development
Asian Americans and Public Higher Education in California	Robert B. Yoshioka
Blacks and Public Higher Education in California	Nairobi Research Institute: Ralph Dawson Robert Singleton
Goals for California Higher Education: A Survey of 116 College Communities	Richard E. Peterson

APPENDIX D

NOTES

Chapter I

[1]"From the Minutes of the Master Plan Survey Team," provided by the Coordinating Council for Higher Education, Sacramento.

Chapter V

[1]Master Plan Survey Team, A Master Plan for Higher Education in California 1960-1975 (Sacramento: State Department of Education, 1960), p.72.

[2]Robert O. Bess, "Statement Before the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education on Access to Higher Education," May 3, 1972.

[3]K. Patricia Cross, "The New Learners," Change, V (February, 1973), p.31.

[4]James W. Brent and Leland L. Medsker, Beyond High School (San Francisco: Jossey Boss, 1968).

[5]Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, New Students and New Places (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971), p. 97.

[6]Northeastern California Higher Education Study, Council Report 72-7, Coordinating Council for Higher Education, December, 1972.

[7]A.J. Jaffe and Walter Adams, "Two Models of Open Enrollment," in Logan Wilson (ed.), Universal Higher Education, Costs, Benefits, Options (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1972), pp. 223-251.

[8]Frank Newman et al, Report on Higher Education (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1971) p.1.

[9]Alexander W. Astin, College Dropouts: A National Profile, ACE Research Reports, Vol. 7, No. 1, (February, 1972).

[10]Newman, op. cit., p. 3.

Chapter VII

[1]Michael Marien, "Space-Free/Time-Free Higher Learning: New Programs, New Institutions and New Questions," Notes on the Future of Education, 1972, p. 76.

[2]Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, The More Effective Use of Resources (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1972), p. 105

Chapter VIII

[1]1972 Statistical Profile, Independent Colleges and Universities, Prepared by the AICCU Research Foundation for the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities, August, 1972. (Draft)

[2]Ibid.

[3]Ibid. Data Based on average student charges at 20 AICCU institutions with largest number of state scholarship students.

[4]Ibid.

[5]State of California, Budget Supplement for Health and Welfare, Education for 1973-74 (Sacramento, 1973) p. 1271.

Chapter IX

[1] Student Resources Survey, California State Scholarship and Loan Commission, 1972, p. ix.